THE GOSPEL PREACHER

VOLUME ONE

Disc.

Disc.
BX
7327
F7
G6
1870

Franklin, Benjamin, 1812-1878.
The gospel preacher: a book of twenty sermons. By Benjamin Franklin ... 7th ed. Cincinnati, Franklin & Rice, publishers, 1870.
x, 11-500p. 20cm.

1. Disciples of Christ--Sermons. I. Title.

CCSC/map

Gordon W. Hayberg

THE

GOSPEL PREACHER:

A BOOK OF

TWENTY SERMONS.

BY

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

EDITOR OF THE AM. CHRIS. REVIEW; AUTHOR OF SINCERITY SEEKING THE WAY TO HEAVEN; TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE; AND PUBLISHER OF THE F. & M. DEBATE, ETC., ETC.

VOL. I.

THIRTY-FIFTH EDITION

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.:

DANIEL SOMMER, PUBLISHER.

1922

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1896 by
DANIEL SOMMER,
in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

CONTENTS

SERMON I

Page

Evidences of the Divine Authority of the Bible . . . 11

SERMON II

What Must Men Believe to be Saved? 35

SERMON III

How Are Persons Made Believers? 57

SERMON IV

Different Things to which Salvation is Ascribed in the New Testament 81

SERMON V

Men Must Do Something to be Saved 103

SERMON VI

Conversion, or Turning to God 129

SERMON VII

The Adaptation of the Bible to Man 153

SERMON VIII

The Simplicity of the Gospel of Christ 179

SERMON IX

Page
The Two Covenants 205

SERMON X

The Inauguration of the New Institution 229

SERMON XI

Predestination and the Foreknowledge of God 255

SERMON XII

The Necessity of Regeneration 281

SERMON XIII

Union of Christians 305

SERMON XIV

A New Testament Example of Conversion 331

SERMON XV

The Course to Pursue to be Infallibly Safe 355

SERMON XVI

The Love of God to Man 383

SERMON XVII

The Church—Its Purity 409

SERMON XVIII

The Second Coming of Christ and the Destruction of the World 433

SERMON XIX

The Three States of Man - The Fleshly, the Intermediate and the Eternal 457

SERMON XX

The Punishment after Death of Those Who Die in Their Sins 479

INTRODUCTION.

THE author of the following discourses cheerfully conforms to the usual custom, in furnishing a few words by way of introduction to his new volume of sermons. When a new book makes its appearance, the inquiry is at once started, What demand has called forth another book? or, What is the object in offering another book to the world? It is due, both to the writer and the public, that a few words of explanation, in reply to the above and some other questions, should appear here.

1. By means of the periodicals, and other publications, issued from the hand of the author of the following discourses, which have been extensively circulated in this country, and to some extent in other countries, he has become well known to many thousands as a writer and publisher with whom he has no personal acquaintance. Many of those his ardent friends he can never see and address in person. From these the request has frequently been made, during the past few years, that such a series of discourses as the following should be published. To meet the wishes of these, in this respect, has been one reason for the appearance of this volume.

2. Again: there are many thousands, in all quarters of this country and beyond the limits of our own country, who have recognized the name of the writer as a preacher of the Gospel of much success for many years past. It is now true that he has been actively engaged in the ministry of the Word more than thirty years, without the in-

termission of a single week, except in a few instances when compelled by sickness to lay by for a short time, and that more than eight thousand persons have been turned to the Lord by his own personal appeals. Many persons who have been made acquainted with these facts, but never seen him nor heard his voice, desire to see a few of the discourses, as a specimen, which have been effective in the achievement of this work. This volume is intended, to some extent, to meet this demand.

3. Numerous persons who have heard the voice of the author of these discourses, and participated with him in the meetings held by him in his extended labors in half the States of the Union, desire to have a few of the sermons they have heard, that they may read and preserve them. They want them because they have heard and will recognize and identify them, and thus call up anew the thrilling surroundings and interesting scenes on the happy occasions of their delivery, in the presence of vast audiences. They want them that their children may read them, and recognize in them *specimens* of the preaching that achieved the great reformatory movement of the nineteenth century, and produced such a revolution in the public mind in this great and rising country. It is an item in the intention of the writer to meet this demand.

4. Many friends have made the suggestion that immense good can be achieved by placing these discourses in the hands of serious persons, that they may consider them candidly and composedly, without the excitement of public occasions. We have no doubt that much good will, in this way, result from them. They want them to send to their friends who reside where they have no preaching from those devoted exclusively to the Gospel of Christ, that they may understand the ground we, as a religious body, occupy. The volume is aimed to subserve these ends.

THE CLAIMS OF THESE DISCOURSES.

The author of these discourses is entirely an extemporaneous speaker never in his life having memorized a single discourse either of his own

composition or that of any body else, and never more than three times in his life attempting to read a discourse. He preaches frequently on the same subject, but perfectly extemporaneously, varying widely on different occasions, enlarging or abbreviating as the occasion may appear to require, and as the mind may be more active and fruitful on some occasions than others. While many of his numerous hearers will recognize themes in this volume on which they have heard him, and numerous points on which he has amplified, more or less, in their hearing, they will not find a single discourse which they ever heard or read *word for word.* Still, the themes being the same, and the arguments bearing such a resemblance to what they have heard or read, they will readily recognize them. But probably a half dozen paragraphs can not be found—except in a single discourse—in the volume, corresponding word for word with any thing the author has ever spoken or written. They have all been written exclusively for this volume.

Such themes have been selected as to make the series of discourses similar to what the author has delivered on some occasions, especially the first ten discourses. They are intended for men in the confused, perverted, and unbelieving condition of thousands of well-meaning people of our time, to relieve them of their doubts, perplexities, and confusion, and stay their minds on the *one Lord and his holy teaching—showing them that there is something clear, intelligible, and tangible on which the souls of men can rest.*

The constant aim in preparing these discourses has been to simplify, render every thing easy and clear, thus fitting them for and adapting them to the people. The continual effort has been to *convince, enlighten,* and *turn the sinner to God;* to *build up, encourage, and comfort the saints.* In doing this, numerous difficult, perplexing, and controverted points are introduced, the issues clearly stated, and the truth vindicated, maintained, and defended. The following discourses are aimed to be simply *Gospel discourses,* stating, unfolding, advocating, maintaining, and defending the *Gospel of Christ,* and opposing, exposing, and repudiating every thing in the way of it, or in opposition to

it. This is done in kindness, but in plainness, and with earnestness and force. An effort has been made throughout to furnish these discourses as near in the same spirit and substance as the author speaks as possible.

It will be seen in the perusal of these discourses that the reformatory movement of the nineteenth century is appreciated by the writer of these lines; that he regards the ground occupied in this great movement as invulnerable; as unquestionably right; as capable of the most irresistible advocacy, propagation, and defense; as the only hope of the present generation. It is nothing less than to return to the original ground in all things; to stand precisely where the apostles and first Christians stood; receive precisely the same Gospel received by them; preach it as they preached it; believe it as they believed it, and practice it as they practiced it. As to this being not only the best thing that can now be done, but the only thing that can be done, with any hope of uniting Christians and converting the world, the writer hereof never expects to entertain a single doubt.

The themes of the following discourses are discussed as if the hearer were supposed to be listening for the first time to Gospel discourses—as if the entire matter were new to him. They are prepared in this style purposely, for the reason that the object is to give them as *specimens* of the author's preaching, as nearly as possible *as he preaches*, and many who will read them will need the elucidations found here of the plainest matters. No attempt has been made only to bring the Gospel of Christ to the understanding, unfold it, defend it, and enforce it on the hearer, to the exclusion of every thing else. As Paul explained that the grace or favor of apostleship was given to him that he "might preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ," and "to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ;" so now, the real purpose of every man who knows the meaning of preaching the Gospel ought to be, not to blind men, but to "make all men *see*," or "to enlighten all men as it respects the fellowship of the mystery," which, from the

beginning of time had, to the time of the apostles, been hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ, but which were then revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit.

These sermons come not with any claim of originality—any wonderful discoveries of any thing new or startling; they claim simply to be *sound Gospel discourses*, without display or flourish, in the native style of the author, addressed to the minds, hearts, and consciences of men, in reference to the most wonderful realities known to our fallen and sinful race, with the desire to make men happy, benefit and save them. They come not to engender strife, but to make *peace*—final and everlasting *peace*. To show men how to enjoy the peace of God and be at peace with all good men, is of transcendent importance. The writer believes there is a *peace ground*—a union ground—where all the good and true, the pure and holy, can unite, enjoy God and the holy fellowship of the saints, and, with one heart and one soul, labor together to turn the world to God. This ground, he believes, is pretty fully developed in the following discourses, and the objections to it shown to be without foundation, and swept away. It is confidently believed by the writer that the reader of the following discourses will find a ready relief from many of the perplexing questions of our time—a clear path for him to pursue, and full encouragement—if he has simply an honest desire to serve God and be saved.

The teaching in these discourses, any man who reads them will readily see, is the same in substance with the teaching of the venerable men who led the way in our glorious reformatory movement, with the most of whom the writer has had a personal acquaintance, and with all of whom he has been familiarly acquainted by reputation. To understand and give to others an understanding of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments containing the will of God to man; to do that will of God, and induce others to do it, on earth as it is done in heaven, was their great aim. This great aim can not be wrong. The writer claims to unite with them in this great aim, and offers this volume as a mite contributed in carrying out this aim.

The Bible, in its own divine character, and for the purpose the Lord

had in giving it, must be restored to the people—not merely in a neatly-printed volume in our mother-tongue, but in its own native power and grandeur. Its divine authority must be asserted, maintained, and defended, not only as true, divine, from God, but it must be enforced, urged, and continually impressed on the hearts and consciences of men. As a people, we must make all men know that we are simply for the Bible, in its own true import, purpose, or intent; for the God of the Bible, in the character ascribed to him in the Bible; the Messiah of the Bible, with the divine character ascribed to him in that holy book, and his offices; the Holy Spirit of the Bible, with the office and work ascribed to him in the Bible; the religion of the Bible, in all its parts—its facts, its commandments, and promises; its faith, obedience, and hope; its rewards and punishments—the whole of it, no more, no less. To it and to its Divine Author we have vowed eternal allegiance; to develop it, enforce it on the minds, hearts, and consciences of mankind; to advocate, propagate, maintain, defend, and perpetuate it has been the work of the author of the following discourses for a third of a century; to be enrolled with its friends, a co-laborer with them, and have their fellowship; to have their God for his God, their cause for his cause, and their final inheritance for his inheritance, is the highest honor he desires. If this volume shall, in any goodly degree, enlighten sinners, encourage, comfort, and strengthen the saints, the purpose of the writer will be fully accomplished.

BENJ. FRANKLIN

THE

GOSPEL PREACHER.

SERMON, No. I.

THEME.—EVIDENCES OF THE DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE.

TEXT.—"To whom he showed himself alive, after his sufferings, by many infallible proofs."—ACTS i: 4.

THE Evangelist Luke, author of the book styled Acts of Apostles, made the statement just read, and now selected as a text for a discourse on the Divine Authority of the Bible. It is a fundamental statement, when properly considered. It is not simply that Jesus was shown to his apostles after his sufferings, nor that he was shown to them *alive*, but *he showed himself* to them alive. Nor is it all, that he showed himself to them alive, nor that he did this by *proof*, nor that he did it by *proofs*, nor that he did it by *many proofs*, but he showed himself alive by *many* INFALLIBLE *proofs*. The apostles not only saw the Lord, and saw him alive, but he showed himself to them alive; and gave them proof, and not only proof, but proofs; not only proofs, but more, many proofs; and even more than that, *many infallible proofs, that he was the Lord himself*. This grand statement is fundamental; involving the great issue between

the believers in the Bible and unbelievers; the friends of the Bible and the enemies. It involves the foundation of the entire revelation from God to man. If this statement is true, the Bible is true and from God, and all the consequences follow, whether we understand them or not. With this statement the Bible stands or falls; and with it stands or falls our faith and our hope of all beyond this life.

If Jesus showed himself alive after his sufferings by many infallible proofs, he rose from the dead. On his resurrection from the dead, the entire question turns. An impostor could not have raised himself from the dead. God would not have raised an impostor, and thus aided him in palming off an imposition on the world. If Jesus rose, God raised him. If God raised him, he is Divine. If he is Divine, all he ever said is true. This is the foundation of the entire matter of revelation. He said he was with the Father before time began; that the Father loved him before the foundation of the world; before the founding of *kosmos*, or the material world. "Before Abraham was, I am," said he. He said he came down from heaven. "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last; the Bright and Morning Star, the Root and Offspring of David. I am He who was dead, and am alive; and behold, I live forever and ever. I am He who was, and who is, and who is to come, the Omnipotent." He was before all things, and by him all things consist. It was by him and for him the universe was made. He is the express image of the invisible God and the brightness of the Father's glory. In him dwells all the fullness of the Deity bodily. The apostles say, He knew all things. He came before the world as no other teacher ever did, declaring, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man comes to the Father but by me." "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me."

There is no account of his having been educated, or having any opportunities, in continuous association with the wise, the learned, and the great. On the contrary, he was evidently brought up in comparative obscurity. Yet, on coming forth from this obscurity, to the position of a public instructor, the very first time he opened his lips, and on every subsequent occasion, he showed that he knew all about man, what was in him, even to his very thoughts; that he knew the Scriptures thoroughly; the patriarchs, the prophets, and the entire history of man, from the creation down to his time. He was never deceived nor disappointed by any man, nor set of men, but saw through them and all their designs; knew and frequently foretold the results that would follow. From the day he entered his public ministry till he ascended to heaven, it is clear that he saw all things in advance, comprehended all that was coming, and that even his enemies were blindly following the program he had marked out for them, without seeming to know that they were confirming his claims as a prophet, and proving that he could see the future as clearly as the past.

The issue to be examined in this discourse is not about an opinion, a speculation, or some intricate theory, but about a *person*—the most wonderful person that ever appeared as an inhabitant of this earth. The issue now in hand is not about his personal appearance either, his manners, or peculiar points in his teaching, but about *Him*, AS A PERSON. The whole issue centers in and turns on one question. That question is, *Did he rise from the dead?* If he rose, his claims are all established. The Bible is a Divine Book. If he did not rise, his claims amount to nothing, and the Bible is without Divine authority, and only to be regarded as any other book of antiquity. Before coming to the main point of discussion, it is necessary to array before the mind the two parties—the friends and the enemies of Jesus, the believers and

unbelievers; examine their ground, what they claim, what they propose; what they affirm and what they deny; how far they agree and wherein they differ.

What, then, do unbelievers claim? What do they affirm? What do they advocate? What do they defend? The deliberate answer to each of these four questions is, Nothing, nothing under the shining heavens, either for this world or the world to come. They claim nothing, affirm nothing, advocate nothing, defend nothing. They deny Christ, the apostles, the prophets, and the Bible, as possessing Divine authority, but propose nothing instead. They would take the Bible from us, our faith and hope, but propose to give us nothing in return. They would take away the Church, the ministry, and all our religious edification, but propose nothing in return. They would take away our worship, and all the hallowed memories of the kingdom of God, but give us nothing in return. In casting away the Scriptures and the Savior, they do not propose any other system of religion. They believe no other. They believe nothing, advocate nothing, and defend nothing. They simply deny what others believe, pull down what others build up, oppose what others defend. They have nothing to offer you but doubts, instead of your unshaken faith; confusion, instead of your clear and intelligible understanding of the right way of the Lord; their want of confidence, instead of your confidence; their restlessness of mind, instead of your peace with God; their wavering and continual distrust of everything, instead of your full assurance of faith; their want of confidence in God, instead of your everlasting trust in him.

We might have some reason for listening to a man who proposes something, but certainly none in listening to a man who proposes nothing; who has nothing to believe; no theme, except how many things he does not believe; how

many things *he does not* understand; how much is absurd, inconsistent, and contradictory to his mind. We can not lean on things that we do not believe, nor things that are absurd. We must have something in which we have confidence, which we believe, living and dying, in order to happiness. To be happy, the soul of man must have something on which to rest; on which to lean with the fullest assurance of faith.

Nor is it in the way of the full assurance of faith, that we find some things in the Bible that we do not understand, or can not explain. That only proves that the Bible, in that respect, is like all the works of God, deep, profound, and wonderful, beyond the comprehension of the human mind. But the matter now to be investigated is not of that character. It is a question of *fact*. The same mind required in the investigation of questions in the arts, in science and history, is required here; the same reason and understanding also. The friends of the Bible come before the world with a proposition, on which, in the nature of the case, every thing rests, and on which they rest every thing—an affirmative proposition. But to approach the question with intelligence, it is necessary to look at the surroundings, and ascertain what is admitted, what is denied, and the real ground of controversy. The following items are admitted:

1. That there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth.
2. That he lived at the time assigned to him in the Bible.
3. That he lived in the country assigned to him in the Bible.
4. That he was nailed to the Roman cross.
5. That he actually died on the cross.
6. That the body was given to Joseph of Aramathea.
7. That Joseph laid it in his own new tomb.
8. That a great stone was placed at the entrance of the tomb, and an armed guard of Roman soldiers was stationed

over it to guard it; that the directions given those who posted the guard there, were, to "make it as secure as you can."

9. That the reason for posting the guard there, was that the enemies remembered that he said he would rise the third day, and they feared that his disciples would steal the body and tell that he had risen from the dead.

10. That early on the morning of the third day, the body was missing—that it was not in the tomb.

In all these points there is a perfect agreement among both friends and enemies. A dissenting voice is not heard. But here comes the real issue. It is in accounting for the absence of the body. The two parties—the friends and the enemies—account for its absence in two different ways. The friends say, *the body was raised from the dead.* The enemies say, *the body was stolen.* Here is the issue. So far as the information goes, no other ground has been taken by any body The judgment must be made up between these two grounds. The testimony and surroundings on each side must now be briefly considered. Turn your attention to the enemies' side first. What is their position? It is that *the body was stolen.* Who were their witnesses? The Roman guard, consisting of sixty soldiers. The *number* of witnesses is sufficient to prove any thing, all things being equal. To what do they testify? That the body of Jesus was stolen from the tomb. So far the testimony appears clear and conclusive. Who stole the body? They say the disciples stole it. That statement also appears clear and conclusive. Where was the guard when the theft was committed? They were all at their post. That appears to place them in a proper position for witnesses. What were they doing while the disciples committed the theft? They say *they were asleep.* This involves their testimony in the depths of absurdity, and completely destroys it. Stop and consider the matter.

1. If they were confessedly asleep, how did they know the body was *stolen?* How did they know the disciples stole it? If they were asleep when the body disappeared from the tomb, how did they know that it did not rise and walk out? The confession that they were asleep when the body disappeared from the tomb, had it been true, was a clear confession that they knew nothing about the question *how the body disappeared,* and could not be competent witnesses touching the question in dispute. Had they been asleep, they could have testified that, when they awoke from their sleep, the body was gone from the sepulcher, but certainly could not have testified as to the manner in which it disappeared. These considerations set aside their statement as wholly unreliable.

2. But their statement is unreliable on another account. It was certain death, under the Roman military law, for a soldier to be found asleep while on guard. Then the guard was divided into different watches, and each watch only required to be on guard six hours at a time, involving no necessity for being sleepy while on guard. Then, it would have been marvelous for the entire watch to have fallen asleep at once, and so soundly asleep, as not to have been awakened by the rolling away of the stone from the entrance of the tomb, which was "very great," and the entire transaction of taking away the body! This is an incredible story.

3. But if they were asleep, why were they not brought to account and punished, for violating the military laws, especially in such an important case? There is not a word about their being tried or punished! If the confession of their having been asleep had been believed, would the whole thing have passed off thus quietly? By no means. They would have been tried and punished.

4. They had the disciples completely in their power. Why did they not confront them with the body, and compel

them to return the body when they commenced telling that it was risen? The reason is, they did not believe the story themselves. They knew that the disciples did not have the body in their possession.

5. What motive could the disciples have had in stealing the body? They could not have made it alive. They would have known that they could have been compelled to return it, and that, it being found in their possession, would have been a means of exposing them. They knew they were powerless, and that there would have been no difficulty in bringing them to punishment.

6. It is also true that the disciples never understood what he said about rising the third day, and did not believe that he would rise. They believed, till the last, that his kingdom would be an earthly kingdom, and that he would be an earthly king; and, when he died, all their expectations in him were blasted. They went away, saying, "We thought it was he who was to have redeemed Israel." They gave all up as lost. After he *rose*, they still had the idea of a civil government in their heads, and said to him, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"

7. The thing reported was impossible. The moon was at its full, giving light all night. The Jews from all nations under heaven were there, in attendance on their great anniversary, tented in all directions; and the Roman guard ever watchful, was there, rendering it impossible for those discouraged and disappointed disciples to have gone to the tomb, rolled away the stone, taken the body, and conveyed it away unobserved. The man who can believe the story that the disciples stole the body of Jesus, as reported by the guard, ought never to say any thing about the credulity of Christians, for he can believe not only *without evidence, but against all evidence and reason.* There is nothing here on which any human being can rest the soul.

But now turn your attention to the other side, and consider the account. How do the friends of Jesus account for the absence of the body from the tomb on the morning of the third day? Their account of the matter is, that he rose from the dead. Who are their witnesses? The following list is given by Paul:

1. He was seen alive, after his resurrection, by Cephas.
2. He was then seen by the twelve apostles.
3. Afterward, he was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once, the greater portion of whom were still living when Paul wrote the first letter to the Corinthians.
4. After that he was seen by James.
5. Then by all the apostles.
6. Last of all, by Paul.

These witnesses were not all present, it will be observed, on all the occasions alluded to; nor are these occasions the only ones on which he was seen; nor are the persons here enumerated the only persons who saw him after he rose from the dead. But these are sufficient for the present purpose. They did not all see nor observe the same things; but among them were some who saw him repeatedly during a space of forty days; who ate with him, drank with him, handled him, heard him, and, on sundry occasions, had the fullest opportunity to make themselves competent witnesses. In these interviews, he talked over many of their previous transactions, explaining things he had taught them, and bringing all things to their remembrance. Concluding these personal interviews with them, he took them to Mount Olivet, and in their presence, and in open day, ascended up into heaven. This makes substantially the case. The next thing is the examination. There are but two grounds on which testimony can be made doubtful. 1. If there can be shown a possibility of mistake on the part of witnesses, it renders the testimony doubtful. 2. If the honesty of the

witnesses can be questioned, it renders the testimony doubtful. But if the witnesses *could not have been mistaken, nor dishonest,* there remains no ground of doubt. These are the two points now to be examined.

I. Could these witnesses have been mistaken? They certainly could not. If they did not testify to the truth, *they knew they did not.* There was no mistake about it. The reasons for saying they could not have been mistaken must be given somewhat in detail:

1. He was seen on too many different occasions, by too many different persons, and by some of these persons too often, for them to have been mistaken. If but twelve persons had seen him but one time, in open day, the testimony would have been considered conclusive. But he was seen of above five hundred brethren at one time, by the twelve more than once, and by several others again and again, during a space of forty days. So many of them saw him so frequently, that they could not have been mistaken. If what they said about seeing him was not true, they knew it was not true.

2. There could have been no mistake about identifying him on these occasions, for there were so many who saw him, and the opportunities for identifying him were such as to render it impossible for them to have been mistaken. They saw him in daylight, ate with him, handled him, and conversed with him. In these interviews he rehearsed many things he had said, and spoke of many things he had done before his death. The interviews were too numerous, the conversations too extended, and the things on which they discoursed were of such a nature as to identify him beyond all dispute.

3. They were with him in open day, heard him say that he was about to leave them, and return to his Father; and on the Mount of Olives they saw him ascend to heaven

They saw, also, a convoy of angels, who said, "Why stand you here, gazing up into heaven? That same Jesus, whom you see ascending into heaven, shall so come in like manner as you have seen him ascend into heaven." There could have been no mistake about the main matter here. If these things were not true, they knew they were not true.

4. The apostles claimed that the Lord, after he ascended to heaven, gave them power to heal all manner of diseases—to give sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb. They said they did all these things. In saying this, they could not have been mistaken. They knew whether they did these things.

5. Some of these witnesses made statements that could have been proved false, if they had been false, by almost any number of persons. As samples: the statements of Matthew, published in Palestine, eight years after the death of Christ, that he fed thousands, in open day, by miracle; that there was a great earthquake when he died; that there was darkness over the whole land from the sixth till the ninth hour; that the vail in the temple was rent in two from the top to the bottom; that the rocks were split; the statement of Paul, that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once. These, and many more statements like them, could have been disproved by almost any number of witnesses, if they had not been true; and the enemies could have thus defeated the apostles. But instead of these statements being refuted, they are confirmed by all the testimony in the world, in any way bearing on them. They stand, not only uncontradicted by anything written in that age, but corroborated by every authority having connection with them. These were statements about which they could not have been mistaken.

6. They claimed that they were inspired by the Savior, empowered to make revelations from God, and to speak in all

the languages under heaven—languages that they had never learned. They knew whether they had received these revelations and whether they could speak these languages. They could not have been mistaken here.

This is certainly sufficient to show that there was no ground for mistake on the part of these witnesses in regard to the matter in hand. If the things they testified to were not true, they knew it.

II. The other side remains to be considered. Could they have been dishonest? Could they have been pretenders? They certainly could not, for the following reasons:

1. They had no inducement to tell falsehoods touching the matter in hand. Every earthly interest they had was against the ground they took, and in favor of their renouncing it.

2. That Jesus rose from the dead, if not true, was the most unpopular and unwelcome story that any man or set of men could have told at the time in which they lived. The idea, that these timid men would have had the boldness and determination to face the world, Jews and pagans, and declare persistently that Jesus rose from the dead, knowing it to be false, is the very climax of absurdity.

3. Admitting the possibility of these timid and cowardly men (as they were before the death of Christ) to have had the effrontery to stand up in Jerusalem, before the learned rabbis, the doctors of the law, the scribes and priests, at the first, and declare that Jesus rose from the dead, knowing that they were telling a falsehood; still, there remains no way of accounting for their **persistence** in their statement, and maintaining that it was true, though every possible means were used to induce them to recant, till they sealed their testimony with their blood. What man of intelligence can believe that these men were dishonest; mere pretenders; telling what they knew to be false, and that they were true to their original

purpose, and every man of them stood by every other man in telling and maintaining the falsehood, through stripes, imprisonments, and banishments, till the last one was martyred for telling the falsehood, and not a man of them could ever, by any means, be induced to give it up? The man who can believe this ought to say nothing of the credulity of Christians! It is to believe that men can have two opposite characters at the same time, and maintain both till death; that they can be hypocrites, pretenders and deceivers for life, engaged in palming off a grand falsehood on the world; and yet so true to their falsehood and to each other, that not one of them ever could be induced to betray and expose the falsehood or his fellow-witnesses. Not one of them ever could be induced to save himself from stripes, imprisonment, or death, to turn States evidence! What they stated at the first, they stated at the last.

4. Take Paul as a more particular example. Three times he was beaten with rods, once he was stoned. Five times he received forty stripes, save one. He was exposed to wild beasts in Ephesus. Finally, in Rome, he was deliberately beheaded. Yet he stood to the same testimony from the first till the last. Can any man doubt that he was an honest man?

5. Those men bore unquestionable marks of honesty, sincerity and candor in the purity of their lives, the purity and correctness of their teaching. They not only taught purity, but practiced it.

If, therefore, these were not honest, sincere and candid men, the world never contained any. They gave the highest evidence that men can give of honesty and sincerity. It is, therefore, impossible for men who understand what evidence is, men of intelligence, to conclude that they were dishonest. It is morally impossible for them to have been dishonest. It follows, then, with the force of dem-

onstration, that, as they could not have been dishonest, **and could not have been mistaken, their testimony is true.** The Lord rose from the dead. He is Divine, and the Bible of Divine authority. He was dead, but is alive, and lives forever and ever. In Him all fullness dwells. He is the head over all things to the Church. He is the way, the truth, and the life.

But now turn back to the first preaching of the apostles. Where did they first preach after he rose? In Jerusalem, where, fifty days before, it was unanimously agreed, he died. Here was a place where the people were better prepared than anywhere else in the world to judge of the truth of their preaching; and among the people who had all the opportunities of knowing whether they told the truth or not, and they, too, the most decided and determined people in their religion on the face of the earth. Here the apostles first stand up, with all the late and present surroundings in the minds of the people, and preach. What is the main ground of the first discourse? That the same Jesus, whom the people had crucified some fifty days before, had been raised from the dead and exalted to the right hand of God, and the sublime display of supernatural power which they saw and heard was from him. Here the people, in thousands, who were posted in the events of the past few weeks, stood around the apostles, and saw and heard what was before them. Their prejudices were all against them. Popularity was against them. All worldly interests were against them. All existing church relations were against them. What is the result? **Three thousand sturdy and determined Jews turned their backs on their former church, their worldly interests, and sins, and yield to the authority of Jesus the Christ.** In a few days, five thousand became obedient to the faith. Shortly the Gospel reached Samaria, and the people, with one accord, gave heed to the things spoken by the preacher of Jesus. Triumph-

antly, grandly, and sublimely it moved onward. In ten years the Gentiles became obedient to the faith. In less than forty years it traveled the length of the Mediterranean Sea and throughout the Roman empire.

Did uninspired fishermen of Galilee; illiterate, timid, and weak men, do all this, in their own strength? Did they do this by telling a falsehood, sticking to a falsehood, and, in their mere human strength, preaching a falsehood? If they did, their falsehood did more than any truth ever did since the beginning of time, for such a revolution had never been brought about before by any sort of preaching, true or false. To say that the apostles did this in their own strength, by preaching a falsehood, and one of the silliest falsehoods ever told, too, if it was a falsehood at all, is to say, that the most stupendous, grand, and sublime religious movement recorded in the world's history, was achieved by weak and ignorant men by preaching a falsehood, in spite of all the learning, talent, money, prejudice, pride, popularity, civil and religious authorities on the face of the earth! The man who will say this, is not a subject of argument.

No doubt, many statesmen, philosophers, men of wealth, and powerful men of the world of different kinds, as well as distinguished religionists of different kinds, of that day, thought the whole affair about Jesus of Nazareth a shallow thing, with which the people had been carried away, and that, in a short time, there would be nothing more heard of Jesus or his apostles. But how stands the case now? Eighteen centuries have gone into the past, and their events are known in history. What has become of the statesmen of Greece and Rome? Excepting a few, their names have gone into oblivion. Where is that mighty civil superstructure, on which they put forth their greatest power and skill? In less than four hundred years, it was divided into petty kingdoms, and the wisdom of the great men who framed the

Roman government was shown to be foolishness with God. Where are the philosophers of Greece and Rome? Excepting a few, their names are not even found in history. Their systems of philosophy have been exploded, and many of the things in which they gloried and prided themselves most, have been demonstrated to be erroneous and false. Where are the men of wealth of those times? Gone, ages since; their vast estates scattered to the winds, and they forgotten.

But where is the name of Jesus of Nazareth? It has been interwoven with the history of the civilized world for eighteen hundred years. Every infidel that now writes a letter, in some form or other, puts down "the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight." Every note of hand, bond, deed, mortgage, bank check, summons, receipt, no matter by whom written, believer, or unbeliever, bears "the year of our Lord on it," either in full or in some abbreviated form. If any man thinks the power of our Lord Jesus the Christ is nothing, or a matter of no consequence, let him inquire for the origin of the observance of the Lord's day or the first day of the week. What statesman, philosopher, or great man of the world, originated the observance of the first day of the week? No great man did it. It originated with Jesus of Nazareth. Has he any power on earth now? Lift up your eyes and look at the stupendous business operations of the civilized world. See the busy multitudes in the departments of agriculture, mechanic arts, commerce, and trade, as the week closes. Then, open your eyes on the Lord's day morning, and see the general suspension! Where is the power that suspends all this? Whose wonderful hand stays and suspends all those busy multitudes? Where did all this originate? You trace back and find the origin of it in the resurrection of our Lord from the dead. Before that event, nothing of the kind described had ever existed on the first day of the week. There had been such a thing

as the observance of the Sabbath or the seventh day, but no observance of the first day as a sacred day, since the beginning of time.

Amid all the unbelief, the hardness of heart, and terrible impenitence of these times, the name of Jesus finds its way into all the records, the legal documents, the documents of State, and the entire literature of the civilized world. Even in the most degraded forms of an apostate church and people, the name of Jesus fills every thing. Where, too, are the names of the apostles? Their names, have gone wherever the name of Jesus is known. Where, is the Gospel of Christ? Written, printed, and circulated, in the Scriptures, throughout the world. After the Jews have hated, despised, and malignantly fought the religion of Christ, the apostles, and the Lord himself, for eighteen hundred years; after the pagan world have fought it as long, and powerful and learned infidels have put forth their most determined efforts to crush it; in one word, after it has stood the criticism and opposition of all the combined influences that could be brought against it, for eighteen hundred years, it is received and believed by more people than at any other period since it became a power among men. What is grandly in its favor is, that the most powerful, enlightened, and elevated people in the world, are the people who receive the Word of God. The most pure, benevolent, and good people in the world, are those who practice the Bible most closely.

Faith in the Savior and in the Bible, never gives way at the approach of death. This can not be said of Infidelity. There is, it may be admitted, now and then a determined case of infidelity, where a man resists the Bible and hugs his infidelity till the last. Cases of that kind are not the rule, but the exception. No man can know precisely; but, in nine cases out of ten, when death is supposed to be approaching, skepticism vanishes away and disperses like mist before the

rising sun, and leaves the soul without any support in the most trying hour. It is simply a matter of fact, that at death, or the supposed approach of death, the faith of the saint becomes stronger and stronger, and the unbelief of the skeptic becomes weaker and weaker. The believer maintains his ground, and leans on his faith to the last. It never fails him. In numerous instances, skeptics repudiate their unbelief with their last breath, and warn their friends against it. Why is this? The reason is, there is reality on the side of the believer. He is founded on the Rock of Ages, and, sings in death, "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord." The dying saint can commend his faith to those he leaves behind. The infidel repudiates his unbelief when he is dying, and admonishes his friends and warns them against it. In the last moments, there is a great difference between the man who can say, "The Lord is my shepherd," and the man who says "There is no God."

But, turning to the skeptic again, before closing the present discourse, What does he propose? To do away with the Bible, the ministry, the Church, and all religion. What are we to have, then? No Bible, no ministry, no Church, and no religion; nor error, nor superstition, nor impositions. Indeed! But the world is filled largely with religious establishments that came not from the Bible, that are not only not authorized by anything in the Bible, but condemned by the Bible. Not only so, but error, superstition, and imposition abound where the Bible has never gone, and is not known—error that did not originate with anything in the Bible. Banishment of the Bible is no guarantee that error, superstition, deception, and imposition shall cease. The Pope, at one time, had the Bible well-nigh done away, but there was more error, superstition, deception, and imposition then than ever existed where the authority of the Bible prevailed. Deception was then reduced to a science. When

they got the authority of the Bible out of the way, the Romish priesthood were organized and confederated in a grand systematic scheme of delusion and deception. The entire scheme was used with no other clear purpose than to delude and deceive the people. It was then that the most terrible spiritual despotism ever known on the face of the earth prevailed and did its work. The reaction from this, in one form of it, resulted in the atheism of France, when the best thing they had for man beyond this life was "Death, an eternal sleep." It was then and there that Jacobinism prevailed. It was then and there they cut off the heads of some of the noblest of men and women. It was then that the king and queen lost their heads. The millennium of Romanism, without the Bible, preceded the tragedies in France, and the millennium of unbelief followed. No man of sense, who is a friend to his race, desires these scenes, or others like them, to be reënacted, or follow on us or our children. Yet you have no security for any thing better without the Bible.

But now some application must be made of what has gone before. The question will come up, How does it follow, as a sequence, that the Bible is of divine authority if the foregoing reasoning is correct? This we will now proceed to show.

1. The foregoing argument is to prove that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the living God. This is the foundation of the divine authority of the Bible. It was in reference to this, that, when Peter made the statement, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," the Lord said, "You are Peter, and on this rock, I will build my Church; and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it." This is the great proposition of the new institution. When it is proved, all minor ones are proved, as a matter of course. This may not be obvious to every person, at a glance, and

the argument must be carefully restated and the reasoning applied.

2. In the foregoing argument, it is assumed that if Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, his claims are established, and all he ever taught is true; but this has not been elaborated. The intention now is to restate, elaborate, and apply it.

3. The whole argument has been shown to rest on the resurrection of Christ from the dead. No power this side of the power of the Almighty could have raised him. The Almighty would not have raised an impostor, and thus aided him in palming off an imposition on the world. This led to the foregoing brief argument to show that he rose from the dead. The result of the argument is as follows: 1. God raised him from the dead. 2. If God raised him, he is the Christ, the Son of the living God; or, which, in amount, is the same, he is divine. All his claims are true. But how does this confirm the divine authority of the Bible? Mainly in the following three ways:

1. He fulfilled numerous predictions of the Old Testament, such as could not, by any possibility, have been fulfilled by an impostor, thus confirming the divine authority of the inspired prophet, who, by the Spirit of God in him, looked down through many long centuries and predicted what would come to pass, and, on the other hand, confirmed the divine authority of HIM who fulfilled these numerous and wonderful predictions. These prophecies, and their fulfillment, connect and interweave the Old Testament with Jesus, so that both stand or fall together. The reasoning turns both ways: The prophets of the Old Testament point to Jesus and find their fulfillment in him. He comes and fulfills their predictions, and thus the divine authority of the prophets and of himself is established.

2 After establishing his own divine authority, he called,

qualified, and sent the apostles, and confirmed their divine mission, thus indorsing them and the portions of the Bible emanating from them. All they said and did is indorsed by him. As certain as he is from God, all the portions of the Bible from them are divinely indorsed. This settles the divine authority of the New Testament.

3. The claims of Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, or, which is the same, Divine, being established, all his acts and words are of divine authority. It is, then, settled that he was with God before the world was; that it was by him and for him the worlds were made; that he was before all things, and by him all things consist; that he who saw him saw the Father; that he thought it not robbery to be equal with God; that he is the express image of God and the effulgence of his glory; that in him all fullness dwells; that the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily in him; that he knew all the past, the present, and the future. That he could look into the past, was evinced by his unlimited acquaintance with all the Old Testament Scriptures, characters, and events, which was shown in all his conversations and discourses. Every thing mentioned in the history of the past was as familiar to him as the passing events around him. He knew all about the flood, Noah, Egypt, Pharaoh, Moses, the kings and prophets of Israel; Nineveh, Tyre, Sidon, Sodom, and Gomorrah. He looked forward, from forty years before the fall of Jerusalem, and saw the Jews fall by the edge of the sword, carried away captive among all nations, Jerusalem trodden down of the Gentiles, and the fulfillment of the times of the Gentiles, events extending down through eighteen hundred years, now fulfilled and fulfilling before the eyes of an unbelieving generation. The whole turns on the following three points:

1. He knew all things.
2. All authority was vested in him.

3. All he indorsed is of divine authority.

What, then, did he indorse? He indorsed Moses, in numerous instances, by quoting him as the word of God and the word of the Spirit of God. He indorsed the historical books of Moses and honored them as from God. He indorsed the law of Moses, as the law of God, in numerous instances and in different forms. He indorsed the principal events of the Old Testament, such as the creation, the Adamic sin and its consequences; the destruction of the world by a flood; the call of Abraham and the promise; the overthrow of Sodom; the fate of the proud monarch of Egypt; the liberation of Israel from Egyptian bondage; the giving of the law; events of Sinai and the sojourn in the wilderness, the crossing of Jordan; entrance into Canaan, etc. He indorsed the writings of David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, as well as other prophets, by quoting them as divine authority. His numerous quotations of the Old Testament, in its various parts, as sacred Scripture, ascribing it to God, to the Spirit of God, etc.; his many references to the Old Testament writings, settles the question of the divine authority with all who believe on Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Having thus indorsed the divine authority of the Old Testament, he turns to the New. "The words thou gavest me I have given them," said he, in his address to the Father. "All authority in heaven and on earth is given to me," said he, before he commissioned the apostles. "Go, therefore, and disciple all nations," etc. His repeatedly meeting with them, talking over all things that had previously occurred between him and them, expounding to them the Scriptures, eating and drinking with them, giving them an opportunity to see him, hear him, handle him, and witness his ascension up into heaven; the endowment of supernatural power, after the ascension, and the continuation of

his wonderful power with them, amounts to a complete indorsement of the apostles, establishing their divine authority, and the divine authority of the portion of the Bible emanating from them. The work they did, the wonders they achieved, and the religious revolution of the civilized world that followed them, in view of their native weakness and inability in themselves to do any such work, demonstrated that the power of God was with them all the time, indorsing all they did and said as of divine authority.

What a grand spectacle to see Him of whom Moses and all the prophets wrote, who was dead and is alive; who is divine; who has all authority in heaven and on earth; in whom all the fullness of the Deity resides fully; standing between the two Testaments, the Old and the New, extending one hand back over Moses and the prophets, fully indorsing the Old Testament as of divine authority; and then turning to the apostles, and extending the other hand over them, and, by indorsing them and accompanying them with the most grand and stupendous displays of supernatural power, indorsing the New Testament, given by them, as of divine authority! This settles the question of the divine authority of the Bible. It is all indorsed by Him, who is the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last. He has gone into heaven, angels, authorities, and powers being made subject to him. He is worshipped by all the angels in heaven. He shall reign until all his enemies shall be put under his feet. To Him every knee shall bow and every tongue confess. To His name be honor and power everlasting.

SERMON, No. II.

THEME.—WHAT MUST MEN BELIEVE TO BE SAVED?

TEXT.—"He that believes not shall be condemned."—MARK xvi: 16.

THIS terrible sentence was uttered by our Lord in his last interview with his disciples before he ascended to heaven. It is a fearful utterance when properly considered in its relations and bearings. Paul says, "Without faith it is impossible to please God," and again, "He who comes to God must believe." Heb. xi: 6. The Lord says, "He who believes not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." John iii: 35. We learn from Rom. v: 1, that justification is by faith. It is a matter of profound gratification, that, in the midst of the confusion, misunderstanding, and mysticisms of these times, there are some important points on which all are agreed. One thing in which all are agreed is, that there can be no justification or spiritual life without faith. No man can come to God, please God, or be accepted of God without faith. Without faith, no man can be saved from his sins now, nor from eternal condemnation in the world to come. The condemnation of heaven rests on the man who believes not. This is stated in the Scriptures as clearly as language can make it. It is a matter settled and agreed to by all who receive the Bible.

If, then, it is settled, that a man can not be saved unless he believes, a question of momentous importance rises. That

question is, "*What* must we believe?" This question contains the theme for the present discourse. It is useless to perplex our minds about the question whether justification is by faith *alone*, or by faith and *something else combined*, till we settle the one about *what* we must believe. This lies at the foundation. It is the first matter to be settled. We can take no other step correctly, do no other thing acceptably, nor please God at all till we believe. Nor is the question, What must we believe to become a Quaker, a Shaker, a Romanist, a Unitarian, or a Universalist. What a man must believe to become one of these, or one of a hundred more similar to them, is a matter of no consequence compared with the question, What must a man believe to be justified before God? This is the great question among those now agitating the minds of men. Among all the beliefs of our time, there is but one through which sinners can be justified and saved in the sight of God. Among all the questions of our day, there is none of the same importance with the one, What is the belief without which the soul of the sinner can not be saved at all? This is the great question. If this can not be settled, and that, too, without ground for a doubt, it is useless to proceed to discuss others. We must live in doubt and die in despair. But, thanks to our heavenly Father, *it can be settled.* By his blessing, *it shall be settled in this discourse.*

The inquiry is not what it would be *well* to believe, or what it would be *better* to believe than something else; nor what it would be respectable or popular to believe, but *what* is *it* that a man must believe, or be condemned—lost forever?

No doubt, many look on this question as so plain and easy that it is useless to discuss it. True, it is so plain that all ought to understand it; yet many do not. Many of the fashionable and educated, in the highest circles of life, who

go to and belong to church, could not tell what they believe if it were to save them from perdition. A reason why such can not tell what they believe is, that they do not believe any thing. They are simply non-believers. It is a fact, that a large number go into a church, commit themselves to the church, without ever reading, or hearing read, the creed, and utterly without knowing what is in the creed. It is useless for these to talk about faith, their creed, or any other creed. They know what church they have joined, but know not what is in the creed, or what is the belief of their church. Faith has nothing to do with the action of such people. All creeds are the same to them. They know nothing of what is in any of them. They have started out with the popular idea, that "there is good and bad in all churches; that all ought to belong to some church, but it is no difference what church, 'if the heart is right.'" They have fallen in love with some church because of its fine organ, delightful music, pleasant minister, fine house, respectable members, or their special associates being there, and not on account of any creed or any belief, for they know nothing of any creed and have no belief. They simply know that they belong to a different church from some of their neighbors, but do not know what the difference is. They are deceived, thinking that they are believers, when they not only believe nothing themselves, but do not know what a man should believe to become a Christian.

A Calvinist and an Arminian can not fellowship each other, because the one is a Calvinist and the other is an Arminian. The one holds the five points of Calvinism and the other the opposite five points of Arminianism, and they can not possibly fellowship each other on account of the difference in their faith. But inquire of the Calvinist what the five points of Calvinism are, and in nine cases out of ten he can not tell. Neither can the Arminian tell what the

opposite five points of Armenianism are. Yet the one is a Calvinist and the other an Armenian; and, though the one does not know what Calvinism is, and the other does not know what Armenianism is, the one believes Calvinism and the other Armenianism, and they can not fellowship each other because *their faith is not alike!* What is the difference to them whether it is alike or not, when they do not know what it is? This is the case with nine-tenths of the differences of our time. The people immediately connected with them do not know what they are, and if they did know, they would be none the more certain, on that account, of being saved.

In the commission, the Lord said: "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." The Gospel is, then, what must be preached. The Lord proceeds: "He that believes." He that *believes what?* He that believes *the Gospel*, certainly. The Gospel, then, is what the Lord commanded the apostles to preach, and what hearers were required to believe. The amount of it is, then, that the Lord commanded *the Gospel* to be preached, required *the Gospel* to be believed, and declared that he that believes not *the Gospel* shall be condemned. But some man will say: "All sorts of preachers profess to preach *the Gospel*, and I see not how to determine which *is the Gospel*." There is a way to test the matter. Does a man claim that he is preaching the Gospel when preaching Calvinism? If he does, the Lord says: "He that believeth not the Gospel shall be condemned." Dare he say: "He that believes not Calvinism shall be condemned?" He will not say this. Or, to place the matter in a different form, we will look at it as follows:

A man can not be a Christian and not believe the Gospel.

Calvinists themselves admit that a man can be a Christian and not believe Calvinism, for they admit that there

are Christians among the Armenians, and they do not believe Calvinism.

Therefore, Calvinism is not the Gospel.

Nothing can be clearer than that if a man can not be a Christian and not believe the Gospel, but can be a Christian and not believe Calvinism, Calvinism is not the Gospel, and, consequently, not what a man *must* believe to avoid condemnation.

This same reasoning may be applied to Armenianism.

A man can not be a Christian and not believe the Gospel.

A man can be a Christian and not believe Armenianism, as Armenians themselves admit.

Therefore, Armenianism is not the Gospel, nor what a man must believe to avoid condemnation.

The same rule may be applied to Universalism.

A man can not be a Christian and not believe the Gospel.

A man can be a Christian and not believe Universalism, as Universalists themselves admit.

Therefore, Universalism is not the Gospel, or what a man must believe to avoid condemnation.

Some man may say, "Try Campbellism by the same rule." There is no need of any trial in this case, for it is granted, if there is any such thing, that Campbellism is not the Gospel. Whatever may be said of the isms, of which an example is here given, and all such, whether true or false, they are not the Gospel, nor what a man *must believe*, in order to justification, or what a man must believe, or be condemned. Whatever the Lord requires a man to believe, it is not any of these isms. Belief in any one of them is not what the Lord requires; nor will unbelief in any one of them condemn any man. True or false, as mere questions, there is no salvation in believing them, nor condemnation in not believing them.

It is not necessary to pursue this negative examination

further, or the inquiry touching what a man *need not believe*. The matter now is to determine what a man *must* believe. Among all the beliefs of the world, what belief is it through which the sinner is justified before God? By reference to John xx: 30, 31, we learn what he wrote out his testimony concerning Christ for. He says: "Many other signs truly did Jesus, in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you might believe." This gives the purpose of the apostle in writing his book: "These are written *that you might believe*." The next question is, That you might believe what? He informs us, "That you might believe that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*." This settles the question about *what* we must believe. We must believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. This is the grand proposition to be believed, and the belief of it is the faith that justifies the sinner, or through which the Lord saves his soul. Here some one may start the question, "Is this saving faith?" The apostle proceeds to refer us to the result of this faith, in the same connection, in the following words: "That believing *you might have life through his name*." These things are written that you might believe. The truth to be believed is, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. The object of this belief is, that the believer might have life through the name of Jesus. Here is the grand truth to be believed, and the belief of it is the faith through which the sinner may have life. This belief is evangelical, divine, apostolical—the belief that saves the soul. There is no other belief or saving faith for sinful man. If he has not this, he will be lost. There is no dispute about the belief here advocated. No church repudiates it. The doubts and disputes are all about other beliefs. If a man believes with his heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, he has true faith, divine faith, saving faith,

and there is no other faith through which man can be justified before God.

We can learn something of *what* a man must believe from what he is to confess with his mouth. We will now hear Paul tell, in the same connection, what a man must confess with his mouth and believe from his heart: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. x: 8, 9. To believe that "God raised Jesus from the dead" is the same as to believe that he is the Christ, the Son of the living God; for if God raised him from the dead, he thus demonstrated that all he ever said was true. God would not have raised an impostor. If God raised him from the dead, he thus confirmed his divine mission and all he ever said. His entire claim to be the Messiah, or to be from God, is confirmed, if God raised him from the dead. Indeed, if he rose from the dead at all, it proves his divine mission. An impostor could not have raised himself from the dead. God would not have raised him, and thus have aided him in palming an imposition on the world. The belief, then, with the whole heart, that God raised him, amounts to the same as the belief that he is the Christ, the Son of the living God.

But we will give an example showing the faith on which persons were received in the time of the apostles. Turn your attention to Philip and the Ethiopian officer as they ride in the chariot. Philip is busily engaged in preaching to the officer. What is he preaching? The sacred historian says "He preached to him Jesus." That is certainly a very brief history of what he was preaching, but equally plain. It is certainly what might be expected, that the officer believed what was preached. What did he believe, then? The

sacred writer says, "As they went on their way, they came to a certain water." We will not stop now to speculate about that "certain water." *Water* is not the theme now; faith is the theme. What did the officer *believe?* This is the matter in hand. The officer said, "See; here is water! what doth hinder me to be immersed?" And Philip answered, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." See Acts viii: 36, 37, 38. On this belief the evangelist received and immersed him; and on this belief all the first converts were received and immersed. If this passage is rejected as spurious, we lose nothing but an example. The weight of authority, however, is in its favor, and the thread of the narrative is incomplete without it. It is, therefore, received here.

When our Lord was immersed by John in Jordan, and had gone up from the water, the heavens were parted above him, and the Spirit assumed a visible form, and descended on him. John the Immerser afterward referred to this, saying, "I knew him not, but he who sent me to immerse, said, on whomsoever you shall see the Holy Spirit descending and remaining, he is he," or he is the Messiah. At the time the Spirit descended and rested on him, the Almighty Father spake from the heavens, and uttered an oracle that he did not see fit to utter through the lips of man, angel, or even his own beloved Son, but, with his own voice, he said, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased." See Matt. iii: 17.

Again, in the midst of that transcendantly sublime scene, on the mountain of transfiguration, in the presence of the glorified and immortalized Elijah, from the eternal state; the mediator of the first covenant, Moses, from the intermediate state; and three witnesses of Jesus, Peter, James, and John,

in the flesh; God again repeated the oracle, "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased;" adding to this utterance, made on the former occasion, the command, "Hear you him." To this grand scene Peter refers, in one of his letters to the disciples, in his authoritative declaration: "We have not followed cunningly-devised fables when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased." See 2 Pet. i: 16.

It was in view of this wonderful oracle, that Peter, when the Lord said "Whom do you say that I the Son of Man am?" replied, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Matt. xvi: 16. In this instance, too, we have the importance of this fundamental truth fully brought out The Lord replies, "Blessed are you, Simon, son of Jona: for flesh and blood has not revealed it to you, but my Father who is in heaven." What is it the Father in heaven has revealed? The foundation truth of the new institution. This the Father in heaven revealed on the banks of the Jordan. This central truth—the major proposition of the new institution—that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," is here uttered by Peter and again repeated in the mountain of transfiguration. But now for the prominence which the Lord gives this truth. He proceeds in his reply to Peter: "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." Here the fundamental heresy of Rome had its origin. It perverts this grand truth of the new institution in two important particulars: 1. It expounds the rock on which the Church is built to be *Peter*. 2. It expounds the meaning of the words "the gates of

Hades shall not prevail against it," to be, that "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against the *Church*." By "this rock," the Lord did not mean Peter. Peter was not the theme, but the person to whom the Lord addressed himself on the theme. What was the theme of the conversation? The Lord himself was the theme, and not Peter. "Whom do you say that *I am?*" "*Thou* art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "Blessed are you, Simon, son of Jona, for flesh and blood has not revealed *it*," or *this*. "It," or this what? This confession, unquestionably, which Peter has just made, that "he is the Christ, the Son of the living God." "And," he proceeds, "on *this* rock I will build my Church." Where is the antecedent to "*this* rock?" The theme is not changed. "This," refers back to the same statement, "*Thou* art the Christ." On this truth, concerning Jesus, that *he* is "the Christ the Son of the living God, I will build my Church," and "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against *it*." Against what? Against this *truth*, or this *rock*, and not the *Church*. The theme is not the Church, but the truth, on which it is built. The gates of Hades have nothing to do with prevailing against the Church. But the Lord knew that he would die, and go into Hades, and that he would have to overcome the gates, or powers of Hades, and rise from the dead, or the foundation of the Church, that "he is the Christ, the Son of the living God," would be overthrown. His prediction is an assurance that the powers of Hades should not prevent his resurrection, and thus prevail against the foundation of the new institution. It was an allusion to the grand contest involved in his resurrection from the dead. The issue is over his resurrection. He was put to death. His body was laid in the grave. His soul went to Paradise, an apartment in Hades. At the dawn of light, on the third day, the grand question came: will he rise, or will the powers of

Hades prevail? If he rises, the proposition that "he is the Christ, the Son of the living God," *is sustained*. If he does not rise, *it is lost*. All is suspended on this issue. To this grand issue he looked, and declared "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it,"—the rock, or foundation.

In this light Paul viewed it, in his reference to those disciples in Corinth, who had fallen back into their Sadduceeism and denied the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. xv: 12, he puts the question, "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" He then proceeds to show them that every thing rests on the resurrection of the dead, by bringing to their view the consequences of their denial of the resurrection, or rather the result, if there is no resurrection. He mentions these results as follows:

Result 1. Christ is not risen. Certainly this is correct if there is no resurrection.

Result 2. The apostle's preaching is vain. If Christ did not rise, the preaching, that he did rise, is false.

Result 3. Their faith is vain. They believed what was preached, that Christ rose. If he did not rise, they believed a falsehood. This faith is vain. It could not save them.

Result 4. The apostles were false witnesses, for they testified that he did rise, and that they saw him after he rose from the dead.

Result 5. They were yet in their sins. They could not have been justified from their sins by the belief of a falsehood.

Result 6. Those fallen asleep in Christ are perished, or lost. Their faith, being the belief of a falsehood, that God raised Christ, whom he did not raise if the dead rise not, could not save them, and they are lost.

Result 7. We, the apostles, of all men are the most miserable, for we have given up this world—suffered the loss of all things for Christ; but if the dead rise not all is lost.

After thus showing them where they placed themselves, in denying the resurrection from the dead, he comes out in the following triumphant language: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept." If he rose from the dead, the preaching of the apostles, that he did rise, is true; the belief of that preaching is the belief of the truth; the apostles were true witnesses, in testifying that God raised him; by this faith they were justified; those who had fallen asleep in Christ had not perished, and the apostles were not of all men most miserable. Thus we see how beautifully he rests every thing on the great truth.

Please turn to Paul's opening address, in the Athenian court, in the presence of distinguished jurists, statesmen, and philosophers, as found in Acts xvii: 30: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commands all men everywhere to repent." The times of ignorance to which he alluded were before the Gospel came, and the "now," that he brings in contrast with these times of ignorance is since the light of the Gospel has come. *Now*, since the Lord has come, the light of the Gospel is extended to the nations of the earth—he commands all men everywhere to repent. Paul knew that this was a pretty broad affirmation, and the men before him were not prepared to receive it on his simple statement, and he quickly follows it with the reason for the command for all men everywhere to repent: "Because he has appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained." Still, he knew that they would follow immediately to demand the proof of that also, and he instantly adds: "Whereof he has given assurance to all men, in that he has raised him from the dead." In raising Christ from the dead, God has given assurance to all men that he will judge the world in righteousness, and he commands all men everywhere to repent,

because he will judge the world in righteousness. This is not foreign nor difficult reasoning. If God raised Jesus from the dead he is divine. If he is divine, all he said is true. All he promised or threatened will be fulfilled. The resurrection of Jesus is the foundation of the whole spiritual system, revealed to the world through Christ. This foundation must be overthrown before the Christian's faith can be shaken.

It is of no consequence whether we can explain the questions where Cain got his wife, why the Canaanites and the Midianites were commanded to be destroyed, why God hardened Pharaoh, or how the additions were made to the books of Moses after he was dead, etc. These matters, and numerous others of the same kind, introduced by Tom Paine, in his infidel book, may all be explained, and the difficulty existing in the minds of unbelieving men may grow out of their ignorance. One tolerably clear evidence of this is found in the fact, that the men who have studied the Bible most closely and critically, find the least trouble about these matters. Why have not the great and profound men, who have studied antiquity a life-time, searched the quotations in ancient writings, carefully read and compared the oldest manuscripts, read all the principal histories—Jewish, pagan, infidel, and Christian—stumbled and fell over these difficulties? Because they have found clear and satisfactory solutions of many of them, which leads intelligent people rationally to conclude that if they knew more they could solve *all* these supposed difficulties. True, it is well for a Christian man to examine and explain these matters as far as he can. Still, his faith does not rest on these matters. It rests on something more certain.

The man of understanding begins with Jesus. Whose son is he? What think you of him? Is he the Alpha and Omega—the beginning and the ending—the resurrection and the life? Did he speak the truth when he said, "He

sees me sees the Father," and "before Abraham was, I am?" That "he was before all things, and by him all things consist?" That "it was by him, and for him, that the worlds were made?" That "in him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily?" In a word, is all that is said of him in the Bible true?" It is, if God raised him from the dead. It is all true, if he is the Christ, the Son of the living God. When this is received with the whole heart, or without any dissent, we have found an anchorage. We turn to him, in the language of one of old, "Thou knowest all things." We inquire of him about Moses, Abraham, and the prophets, and find him quoting their language *as the Word of God.* This ends all questions about the Old Testament writings. We see him commission and send out the apostles, and thus indorse them. This settles their authority. He is the chief corner-stone—the foundation. The prophets and the apostles rest on him. The Old Testament and the New rest on him. The salvation of the world rests on him. He is the tried stone, chosen of God, and precious; though rejected by Jewish and infidel builders, he is made the head of the corner, and there is no other name under heaven nor among men by whom we can be saved. He is Lord of all, head over all things to the Church. He was dead, but is alive, and lives for evermore. He has the keys of Hades and of Death, can open, and no man can shut, can shut, and no man can open. He has gone into heaven; angels, authorities, and powers being put in subjection to him. All authority in heaven and on earth is given to him. He says, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me." And again he says, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man comes to the Father but by me." Converts must then be made to him, learn of him, and follow him. Implicitly we should receive what he says, *because it comes from him.*

There is a large amount of unscriptural language used in our time, and which has no foundation in correct principles. Hence, we hear people say they believe in prayer, baptism, communion, etc., but this is not sensible. The faith is not in or does not rest on *baptism, prayer*, or *the Lord's Supper*, etc., but *on Christ*. The entire belief is *on him*. Men are baptized, not because they believe *in* baptism, but because they believe *on him* who commanded baptism. We do not believe commandments, nor believe on them, but *obey* them. We believe on Christ, obey his command to be immersed, to pray, commune, etc., and hope for the things which he promises. He is the foundation of all authority in the kingdom. The man who believes on him, receives him, and obeys him, is moved by his divine authority to do all he does in religion. He is the central idea in the new institution.

Every system in the world has a central point in it. The foundation proposition, on which every thing rests in Mormonism, is that Joseph Smith was a prophet from God. The man who believes this is a Mormon. It is the major proposition of Mormonism, and has all the minor ones in it; or, in one word, has all Mormonism in it. The proposition that Emanuel Swedenborg was a divine prophet has all Swedenborgianism in it. The central idea in the Baptist church is *baptism*. The church takes its name from *baptism*, rallies round it, and makes it the central idea. The central idea in the Presbyterian church is government by a presbytery, and the church is named after this one idea. The central idea in the kingdom of God is the living and glorious person of the Lord from heaven. The faith of the saints rests on him, and all their life, light, and joy are from him. He is brought to man in the proposition, that he is the Christ, the Son of the living God. All Christianity centers and embodies itself in him, as a man's whole polit-

ical creed embodies and centers itself in his favorite candidate. When he goes for the candidate, he goes for his political creed and party, whether he understands it or not. So, when a man believes on the Savior, goes for him, and devotes himself to him, he goes for all he taught, whether he understands it or not. He is then a Christian—a disciple of Christ, and nothing else. It is the concentration, the embodiment of all Christianity in a person, a living and glorious person.

Any one, with a grain of reflection, can see the wisdom of this. In what other way could ignorant and prejudiced Jews and pagans have been proselyted in a single day? How could they have been discipled to Calvinism, Armenianism, Unitarianism, or Trinitarianism in a day? What could they have done with the Nicene creed—the Augsburg, the Westminster, or Philadelphia confession, in hearing one discourse? It requires years to indoctrinate a man in the twenty-five articles of Methodism, or the thirty-nine of Episcopalianism. The result is, that a large number never know what the Church believes, but every one must understand the belief which God requires, and must have that belief himself, for "he that believes not shall be condemned." The Lord has, therefore, embodied the belief in a living and glorious person, and demands of all men that they believe on him, as the grand and glorious concentration of all that is divine. Hence, on Pentecost, on hearing one Gospel discourse, three thousand believed and became Christians in one day. Nor did they join Church without believing, or knowing what they were doing. They learned what to believe on hearing one discourse, and *believed it.* They were justified *by faith*, and not received *without faith.* They believed what was preached—that God had raised Jesus from the dead—that God was with him—that he was divine, and they willingly bowed their souls to him, and took him for

their leader; gladly and implicitly received all he taught, and did all he commanded. On becoming his disciples, they placed themselves under him, as his pupils, students, learners, to be taught by him, and guided to the everlasting city of our God.

The time has now come when this belief is thought not sufficient; that a man must believe something more than this; that if he knows nothing but Christ and him crucified, and specially determines to know nothing more than this—will glory in nothing but the Cross of Christ, he falls vastly short, much below the standard of our times. The popular tendency is to take the mind and heart of the people away from Christ and occupy it with something more, or something else. The time was in this country, when the popular teachers expressed fears that we did not make enough of the Messiah, and they talked of his divinity, his equality with the Father, his eternity, and the like; but what do they now think of him who has all authority in heaven and on earth; the chief among all the ten thousands, and altogether lovely? They treat the belief on him, and those that have that belief, as unworthy of regard and fellowship. Talk to them about uniting on him, following him, believing all he taught, receiving it into good and honest hearts, obeying him implicitly in all things, and hoping for all he promised, and they stand and look on you with amazement, and affect to pray for you as one deluded. But the Lord Jesus is the power in this work, and the men who oppose it must be shown that they stand in exact antagonism to him. "If any man loves not the Lord Jesus Christ, he will be accursed." He is the grand center, and in him men must be united and saved if they are ever united and saved at all.

The authority of men should be set aside and destroyed, and the authority of Jesus restored to the people. The

philosophies, metaphysics, and speculations of designing men must be set aside, and the clear, intelligible, and glorious teaching of Christ and his apostles restored to men. There must be a clear issue made between Christ and all human leaders, between his teaching and all human teaching, between his kingdom and all other kingdoms. There must be no question in the minds of men except about Jesus and his salvation, no issue except between the sinner's soul and Jesus. There must be no question about the theories and speculations of men. There is but one issue, and that one is concerning Christ. Shall I believe on him? Shall I receive him as my teacher, leader, and head? Shall I follow him? Shall I bow my soul to him? obey him? Shall I be his disciple? These are the questions with which the world must be pressed. The great work of the preacher is not to defend himself, his views, or theories, but to defend his Master, Lord, and Redeemer, his cause and kingdom. His work is to lift up his Lord before men, and plead with them to believe on him, trust in him, learn of him, follow and honor him.

The work of all the preachers of Christ is the same. They all have the same Lord over all, blessed forever and ever. They all have the same Gospel. The man who can understand it most fully, enforce it most successfully, and bring the largest number under its hallowed power, and make the most friends to the Lord Jesus, is the best preacher. The main work now to be done is to divorce the people from the rudiments of the world, from the doctrines and commandments of men, from priestcraft, error, superstition, and human traditions, and espouse them to Christ; turn their hearts from men to the Savior, from the love of party to the love of union, from party fellowship to the fellowship of the saints. The problems now to be solved are, Can we teach men to love the Savior more than all other leaders;

to love his teaching more than all other teaching; to forsake all other leaders and follow him? Is it possible, after the long night of darkness, superstition, and error, in which the people have been trained, to restore to their hearts confidence in the Savior of the world, and in his infallible teaching to save men? Can the hearts of the people be won back to the Lord? These are the grand questions now to be tested.

An immense army is now in the field, with no mission but to push the conquests of King Jesus. They have no cause nor conquests of their own to defend. They have no leader but Jesus. Their war is about their great Leader and Head. They are pressing him on the attention of men everywhere. They maintain that every man is for or against him, and call on men as they value their lives, their souls, and their eternal all, to decide whether they are for the Lord or against him; whether they will have Jesus for their leader or not; whether they will have the teaching of Christ and the apostles or not. They intend, by the favor of God, to push the teaching of Christ and his authority through the world. They are narrowing the controversy down and bringing it to a single point. It is Jesus and *his* teaching. They are for nothing else. Those opposed to Jesus and his teaching are their opponents, and no others.

They have the faith in God, that he will strengthen their hands and sustain them in their great work of restoring, in all its fullness, the authority of the Christ, his pure worship, his teaching, and all things as they were at the first, and unite in him, who is all in all, to live in one grand and harmonious fellowship, to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, in the one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one immersion, and one God and Father of all, above all, through all, and in all, that one triumphant

hallelujah may rise, as a precious incense, to him that lives forever and ever.

Then, when we shall have finished our course and lie down on the bed of death, we can rest on his blessed words: "As I live, you shall also live." "I will never leave you nor forsake you." "I am able to keep you from falling." "None can pluck you out of my hand." "Be faithful till death." And again, "He who endures to the end shall be saved."

But, before closing, attention must be given to such as are aliens, foreigners, and strangers, without God, and without hope, in the midst of all the uncertainties of this world. These are separated from the Lord, living as if they did not believe he existed. They have never even sanctified their lips by confessing his name, nor made a solitary effort to obtain his mercy. In one moment all possibility of their being saved might be cut off forever. They might go away into the outer darkness, with all the foul, the corrupt, degraded, and disgraced spirits that inhabit the regions of darkness and despair. They may then look back, think of their folly, their indifference, their hardness of heart, their impenitence, when mercy's sweet voice, in tones of affection, love, and compassion—in kind invitations, heart-felt pleadings, and entreaties with tears—all failed to bring them to the Lord. They may then think of the Cross, the crown of thorns, his writhings, struggles in death, his expiring, the Roman spear, and his blood as it ran down, in crimson streams, to the ground, and believe it to be an infinite exhibition of divine compassion, and inquire: Why did all this fail to reach my hardened heart? They may then call to mind all the precious invitations of the Savior, the apostles, the preachers of their own time; the reasonings, expostulations, and arguments; the prayers and tears, the

solicitudes and anxieties of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, children, and friends—all expended on a hard and ungrateful heart, and yet it lost forever! The harvest is past—the summer is ended! The soul is lost. No more lovely invitations forever! no more entreaties to turn to the Lord! no more grace, nor mercy, nor compassion. The day of grace is gone forever! the door of mercy is forever closed! . .

O man! who will you blame for all this? God loved you; Jesus died for you; the Gospel was preached to you; the saints loved you, prayed for you, wept over you; the Spirit of God said "Come;" the Bride, the Church, said "Come;" and whoever will was invited to come. God was not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. The Savior said, "He who comes to me, I will in nowise cast out." You did not come! You resisted all the love, grace, and mercy of our kind and gracious Father in heaven; you resisted the Savior of the world and all the entreaties of the best friends you had on earth, and rushed down to ruin. You will have to say: "I have done all this myself; I have pulled down ruin on my own head. Against the will of my gracious and most merciful Creator, all his love, kind entreaties, and expostulations; against all the advice, warnings, and persuasions of the truest and best friends I ever had; against the voice of reason, my own judgment, and revelation, I have persisted and done all this! Against all that was good, and pure, and lovely, I persisted, rushed blindly on and down, till I have landed in bottomless perdition. Let others be warned not to come to this place of torment."

Be entreated, then, by all that is good, and pure, and lovely; by the love of Christ, the mercy of God, and the sufferings of the Savior; be warned by the threatenings of

heaven, the terrors of the Lord, and the danger of being lost forever, to turn to the Lord and live; be persuaded by the tender mercies of our God, by all his goodness, by the value of the unfading heavens, and the value of precious souls yet to come, while it is called to-day, and be happy forever and ever. "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation."

SERMON, No. III.

THEME.—HOW ARE PERSONS MADE BELIEVERS?

TEXT.—"Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."—ROMANS x: 17

THIS text is selected because it expresses the general theme for this discourse, which is, *How are persons made believers?* The question has been settled as to what persons should believe to become Christians, or disciples of Christ, in the foregoing discourse. The purpose, in this discourse, is to settle the question as to *how* persons are made believers. What means does our Heavenly Father employ to induce men and women to believe on Christ as the Savior of the world? There are two theories about this, so widely different, that if either one of them is right the other is wrong. One of these theories asserts that God puts forth an *immediate* power, or influence of his Spirit from himself, or a *direct* influence to the soul of the unbeliever, and makes him a believer. The other theory asserts that God puts forth his power or influence through Christ, the apostles, through the Holy Spirit that was in and inspired the apostles, and through the Gospel preached by the apostles, and makes believers. These two theories are wholly irreconcilable. If the one is correct, the other is a delusion, a deception, a cheat. It is useless to talk of charity. Charity may extend to erring people in kindness, pity, and compassion, but no charity can reconcile two theories about the same thing so different, as that God makes

believers by an *immediate* influence, and that he does it by a *mediate* influence. If this work of making a believer is done in one of these ways, it is not done in the other way. This is self-evident.

But now, the question arises, how is this matter to be settled? To what can an appeal be made as authority to settle it? Shall the case be referred to the man who says, "I know the time and place when the immediate power came, took effect on my heart, and made me a believer. I was not reading the word nor hearing the Gospel, and I know that I was made a believer by the immediate power." If the question is to be left to such a man as this, it is useless to continue this discourse. There are many men who will testify the same as this man; but if such testimony is to be regarded, Mormonism, Quakerism, Shakerism, or any other imposture ever imposed on credulous man, can be proved, for they all have any amount of witnesses of the same kind. These witnesses care not what the Bible says, what the Lord or the apostles have said. They refer you to what they have *experienced*, but in their case you have nothing but the testimony of their tongues. They will not be regarded in this discourse, nor any witnesses, except such as the Lord has shown to be his witnesses, by the most awful, grand, and sublime displays of supernatural power ever addressed to the senses of mortal man. The subject will be treated exclusively for those who believe the Bible. Those who do not believe the Bible will be addressed in another discourse. The Bible is the supreme authority, and the writer will proceed as if every reader believed and regarded it. Indeed, he will, for the time being, assume that every person reading after him believes and regards it.

Let there be a clear understanding, then, at the start. The question is not whether God makes believers. We all admit that God makes believers. The question is not whether

he makes believers by the Holy Spirit. We all admit that God makes believers by the Holy Spirit. Nor is it whether he does it by his power. We all admit that God makes believers by the Holy Spirit and by his power. But does he put forth his power through Christ, through the apostles, through the Spirit in the apostles, through the Gospel preached by the apostles? Or does he put forth his power or influence to make believers, immediately from himself to the soul of the sinner, not through Christ, nor through the apostles, nor the word? This is the question to be settled by Scripture.

The first scripture introduced will be found Acts xi: 14. It is the language of an angel of God to Cornelius, a centurion, of the Italian band. The angel commanded Cornelius to send for Peter, adding, that "when he is come, he shall tell you words whereby you and your house shall be saved." The particular point in this language, to which special attention is invited, is that Cornelius and his house were to be saved by *words*, and not *without words*. Any theory proposing to make believers and save men *without words* can not be received, while the Lord's system, in which men are *saved by words*, is regarded. The question is not whether the Lord *can* save men without words, but whether he *does* in the system revealed in the Bible. The angel says *by words*, and let him who says *without words* bring his proof.

The next scripture introduced is found Matt. xiii. It is our Lord's teaching in the parable of the sower. It is a mercy on us that the Lord explained this parable, as the people of our time would most likely never have found the meaning of it. He says, "Some seed fell by the way-side," some "fell on stony places," some "fell among thorns," and "other seed fell on good ground." The first thing is to determine what the "seed" in this parable stands for, or

represents. This the Lord explains—not in learned and difficult terms, but in the most laconic, explicit, and simple terms: "The seed is the word of God." Any human being, with intelligence enough to be accountable, can understand, that the seed of the kingdom is the word of God. All the products of the kingdom spring from the seed of the kingdom, under the divine blessing. No matter how rich your ground, nor how well you prepare it, nor how honest you labor, you can not raise wheat nor corn without seed; no matter how good the ground, how honestly you labor, nor how much the Lord blesses you with rains, sunshine, and a genial season, you must have the seed. It is indispensable. In the same way, in the kingdom, we must have the seed of the kingdom, or we can not have the products of the kingdom. *Faith* is the very first product of the kingdom, and you can not have it without the seed of the kingdom, the word of God. Men may theorize about faith, the faith of Christ without hearing the Gospel, the seed of the kingdom, from which faith comes, but they will never have it. As well might men talk of corn, wheat, or any other product of the ground, without the seed ordained of God, as to talk of faith without the seed of the kingdom, ordained of God to produce faith. Since the Lord ascended to heaven, a believer in Christ has not been found whose faith did not, directly or indirectly, come from the Gospel.

The next thing in order is the way-side ground. What does it represent? It represents an idle, indifferent, and careless hearer, who does not understand the word when he hears it. There are such men in all communities. There is no such thing as commanding their attention; they are off, and talking about other things, or frequently nothing, or, at most, nothing of consequence; they never give any thing more than a slight and indifferent hearing to the

word. But when they do this, the Lord says, "Then straightway comes the devil, and catches the word of God out of their heart." Do you say "There is no devil?" If you do, this discourse is not intended for you; this discourse is intended for, and addressed to such as believe the Bible. The Lord says, "Then straightway comes the devil and catches away the word." If you do not believe there is a devil, you do not believe Jesus, and are a skeptic, and not the person to whom this discourse is addressed. When this idle hearer, represented by the way-side ground, gives a slight hearing to the word, "then straightway comes the devil." You inquire, What can his mission be? What has roused him and called him up? A man has been hearing the word, and his fiendish, malignant, and premeditated design is to defeat the word of God, and thus defeat the divine means appointed to make him a believer and save him. Hear the Lord describe his work in his own inimitable style: "Then straightway comes the devil and catches away the word." Why does he catch away the word out of his heart? The Lord answers, "Lest he should believe and be saved." See Luke viii: 12. This shows that the word of God is the seed; that it is sown in the heart, that men should believe it and be saved; that the devil understands this work, and when the seed is sown in a man's heart, he comes and catches it away out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved.

What does the stoney ground stand for, or represent, in this parable? It represents a hearer, not so hard as the one just described, but one that hears the word with pleasure at first, and then finds that he will suffer persecution, and "straightway becomes offended because of the word." He yields the word—gives it up. This is the end of the matter with him. You need not follow him, expecting to find where some *immediate* power made him a believer, converted

him, made him a Christian, and saved him, after he had become offended because of the word, and turned his ear away from it. There is no power that the Lord brings to bear on men who turn their ear away from the Gospel, and will not hear it, that converts them and saves them *without the word*. "He that turns away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." See Prov. xxviii: 9.

What does the thorny ground represent? It represents a hearer not so bad as either of those of which mention has been made; it represents a man who receives the word with pleasure at first, is delighted with it and happy, but subsequently is drawn into some of the business operations of the world—banking, merchandizing, stock-trading, etc., and whose whole mind and heart are literally overwhelmed in the affairs of this life; and the Lord says, "The cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word out of his heart." Here you may bid adieu to his professions of religion. When the word of God is by any means taken away out of a man's heart, there is an end to all faith, piety, and devotion to the Lord. In every case, the Lord keeps it in view that "the good seed," which is the word of God, must not only be sown in the heart, but remain in it, or none of the good fruits of the kingdom can be brought forth.

What does the good ground represent? It represents the man who receives the word of God into a good and honest heart, understands it, and, as explained in the parallel passage in Luke, brings forth much fruit. The good and *honest heart* is the soil for the good seed, the word of God. This is the Lord's method of producing the fruits of the kingdom: the good seed, the word of God, sown in good and honest hearts. He does not produce these good fruits of the kingdom without this good seed of the kingdom, the word of God. The Lord does not talk either of producing these good fruits by sowing the seed in a *totally depraved*

heart, but in a *good and honest* heart. If all men were born totally depraved, there could not be in any of them a *good and honest heart.* But instead of all men in an unconverted state being *totally* depraved, and consequently all on one common level, the Lord here divides them off into six classes; the good ground he divides into three classes. Some of it brings thirty fold, some sixty, and some an hundred fold. Thirty fold is good, sixty fold is better, and a hundred fold best. The thorny ground is bad, the stony ground worse, and the way-side worst. Instead, then, of all unregenerate men being totally depraved, and, consequently, precisely alike, he classifies them in six classes: good, better, and best; bad, worse, and worst. Paul makes the same classification—1 Cor. iii: 9–12—with his illustration of gold, silver, precious stones; wood, hay, stubble. Precious stones are good material to go into a building to be tried by fire, silver is better, and gold is best; wood is bad material, hay worse, and stubble worst. This only recognizes what all men of intelligence observe: that whatever theories preachers may advocate, all men are not bad or good alike in an unregenerate state, and, consequently, not *totally depraved,* nor so depraved that they can not receive the good seed, the word of God, into good and honest hearts, understand it, and bring forth fruit to the honor and glory of God. The seed of the kingdom is the word of God, and a good and honest heart is the soil, of the Lord's own appointment, to bring forth the fruits of the kingdom of God. All this shows that there is no room for the idle speculation that some immediate power or influence must give faith. The Son of Man sows, or causes to be sown, the good seed of the kingdom, the word of God. This good seed is received into a good and honest heart that understands it, and brings forth much fruit.

This perfectly corresponds with our Lord's quotation from

the prophet, in the same chapter—Matt. xiii: 13, 14, 15—"By hearing you shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing, you shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should turn, and I should heal them." The trouble with these people, or the reason they were not turned to the Lord, was not in some decree the Lord had made before the beginning of time, nor that they were so depraved that they could not hear nor believe, nor that the Lord would not send his power to enable them to believe; but the reason was *in themselves*, in perversity, which they *could* have avoided, but *would not*. Their heart had *grown*, or *become* gross. It was not so created, but had *become so*. Their ears had *become* dull of hearing. They were not so created, nor by inheritance, but had *become so*. Their eyes they had closed. They had done this themselves. It was not something in their creation, that they had inherited from Adam, or in any decree of God, but an act of *their own*, done for a purpose: "*lest they should see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their heart and turn, and I should heal them.*" They are themselves blamed for the failure, which could not be the case if they were totally depraved and could not believe, repent, nor turn to the Lord.

It is now appropriate that we should have a few clear statements of Scripture, showing how persons are made believers. The first scripture adduced on this point, will be found John xvii: 20 and 21: "I pray not for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word." For whom does the Lord pray here? You answer, For them who believe. True; but he is more explicit, and adds, for "them who shall believe *on me through their word.*" If there are those whose faith did not come through their

word—the word of the apostles—they are not included in this prayer. The Lord did not here pray for them, but for those who should believe on him through their word. This one passage ought to settle the question as to how faith comes with people who believe the Scriptures.

The apostle John bears the following testimony, John xx 30, 31: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name." Here are three grand questions answered:

1. What are these things written for? That you might believe. The apostle here shows the Lord's plan of making believers, or what he has done, that men might believe, or to make faith accessible to them, or put it in their power to believe. These things are written that you *might believe.*

2. What must we believe? That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

3. What is the purpose in our believing that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God? That we might have life through his name. This is the great purpose of our faith, or to give us the privilege of life through his name.

How beautifully the benevolence of God stands out in all this. Man can not believe, without the truth to be believed. The Lord gives the truth, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. This truth can not be believed by man, unless revealed to him, with the testimony required to make it credible. The things in the divine records of testimony given by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, concerning Jesus, are written that we might believe, and that believing we might have life through his name.

The testimony of Peter is in point here, Acts xv: 7: "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles, by my

mouth, should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." This is as clear as language can express any thing. If it was the choice of God, that the Gentiles, by the mouth of Peter, should hear the word of the Gospel and believe, it was not his choice that they should believe *without the word*

Shall the great apostle to the Gentiles be called to testify in the case, as to how faith comes? He says, Rom. x: 17. "So, then, faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." If he had said, Faith comes by *feeling*, by *an immediate* influence of the Spirit, or by any thing else besides *hearing*, it would have been just as easy to so preach. But he settles the question by saying, in so many words, that faith comes by *hearing*. He does not stop at this, but explicitly states what we must hear—that it must be the word of God. He even reasons the matter out. Please hear him: "How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they are sent?" Rom. x: 14, 15. If the Lord had not called and sent the apostles to preach the Gospel, we never could have heard it; if we had never heard it, we never could have believed it; if we had never believed it, we could not have called on the name of the Lord, and, consequently, could not have been saved. This, then, is a settlement of the question of faith coming without the word.

But some man objects, remarking that it was granted, at the outset, that God makes men believers. But he does it *by means*. That is precisely the point under investigation. Does he make believers by an immediate influence or power from himself, exerted on the heart of the sinner, or does he make believers through means? This has been the question from the commencement of this discourse. But was it not granted, at the outset, that he makes believers by the Holy

Spirit? It was, and without any reservation. He unquestionably does it by the Holy Spirit. But can it not be that he makes believers through the Gospel and by the Holy Spirit? There can be no difficulty in this, for the Gospel itself was preached by the Holy Spirit, sent down from heaven, which things the angels desired to look into. See 1 Pet. i: 12. Paul says of these things, "But God has revealed them to us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searches all things, yes, the deep things of God." See 1 Cor. ii: 10. The very same Gospel preached by the apostles, was preached also by the Holy Spirit speaking in them. Indeed, it was not the apostles that spoke, but the Spirit spoke in them; and the person who believed the words which the Holy Spirit spoke, certainly was made a believer by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit operates on men by words or through words. Please attend to a few examples:

1. "Which things also we speak, not in the *words* which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches." See 1 Cor. ii: 13. The Holy Spirit teaches in *words*, then.

2. The Lord said to the apostles, Matt. x: 20, "For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaks in you." The Spirit of the Father *speaks* in the apostles, and those who hear his words and believe them, are certainly made believers by the Spirit. Many men are lauding the Spirit for what they ascribe to him, as a work done *without words*, while they attend not to the words spoken by the Spirit.

3. How did the Spirit operate on Philip to induce him to join himself to the chariot? Acts viii: 29. "The Spirit said to Philip, join yourself to this chariot." The Spirit *said*—he uttered words, that were remembered and embodied in Luke's narrative—"join yourself to this chariot." The Spirit, by words, moved him or influenced him to join the chariot.

4. How did the Spirit influence Peter to go down to the three messengers from Cornelius when he was on the house-top, in Joppa? Luke says, Acts x: 19, "While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said to him, Behold, three men seek you; rise, therefore, and go down and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them." The Spirit operated on him through *words*. These words were remembered by Peter, and reported, so that Luke embraced them in his narrative.

5. Paul says, 1 Tim. iv: 1, "Now the Spirit speaks expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and teaching concerning demons; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron." How is the Spirit said here to operate? The Spirit *speaks*, and not only speaks, but "speaks expressly."

6. Again Paul says, Heb. iii: 7, quoting from the Psalms: "Wherefore, as the Holy Spirit says, To-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness; when your fathers tempted, proved me, and saw my works forty years in the wilderness." How did the Holy Spirit operate in the time of David? By *words:* "The Holy Spirit says." What the Holy Spirit says in this instance is repeated. Heb. iv: 7.

7. Rev. xiv: 13, we have a clear instance of the Spirit speaking: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." We not only have the words, "Yea, says the Spirit," but the precise *words said.*

8. Among the last words of the book of God, we find this: "And the Spirit and the Bride say Come." See Rev. xxii: 17. How does the Bride, or the Church, say Come?

She says it in *words*. In the same way the Spirit of God says Come. He says it in *words*.

9. If it is desirable to lengthen out the lists of Scripture references, in the second and third chapters of Revelation the following expression is found seven times: "Hear what the Spirit says to the churches." We are not commanded to *feel* some impression that the Spirit makes on our hearts *without words*, but to *hear what the Spirit says*.

Here, then, are some fifteen passages referred to, in which it is seen that the Holy Spirit operates through or by words. In this class of scriptures it is also clearly shown that the Gospel, preached by the apostles, was not in *their words*, but in the *words of the Holy Spirit*. The influence or power, then, of these words of the Holy Spirit is the influence or power of the Holy Spirit, and the man made a believer by these words of the Spirit, is made a believer by the Holy Spirit. This is simply intuitively clear and certain. Rom. i: 16, we are taught by Paul that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes, both to the Jew and also to the Greek. It is not power of God, *a* power of God, or one of his powers to salvation, but *the* power or influence of God for salvation, not to *some*, but to *every one that believes*. That is, all that are saved at all. The power or influence of God for salvation is the power or influence of Christ, and also the power or influence of the Holy Spirit. God does not exercise one power or influence, the Savior another, and the Holy Spirit another; but the influence or power of God is also the influence of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. There is *one* power or influence of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the apostles. That one influence God puts forth through Christ, through the Holy Spirit in the apostles, through the apostles, and through the word, to make believers, and turn them to God. The man who yields to that *one* influence, and is led by it, yields to

and is led by the power or influence of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles, and the word; and the man who turns his ear away from and resists that *one* influence, turns his ear away from and resists God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles, and the Gospel, and will certainly be lost. He turns his ear away from and resists *the* power of God for salvation. No matter if he does say he believes in the *immediate* power; no matter if he *does really* believe in the *immediate*, converting power; that is not mentioned in the word of God, and there is not one particle of authority for looking for it. The Gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes.

But when we are talking of "converting power or influence," what is the precise meaning? Some kinds of power or influence will take effect on you, if you are placed in range, whether you understand any thing about them or not. If you place yourself in the cold, it will take effect on you whether you know any thing about it or not. The same is true of heat. If you come in contact with an electric battery, no matter whether you know any thing about it or not, you will be shocked. The same is true of the influence of contagion. But these all take effect on the *body*, the flesh, and blood. The influence or power is rather, and to some extent, mysterious, and we may not be able to know precisely how it takes effect; but we know it does not come through the mind or understanding to the system, but through the system to the mind. But spiritual influence or power does not take effect in the flesh and blood, or in the physical man, only as it does it through the understanding. Put a man in an assembly where the greatest spiritual impression ever made exists, *blind and deaf*, and the power or influence will take no effect on him. But electricity will take effect on him as readily as those who see and hear. Gravitation takes effect on him; so does per-

lence, heat, and cold. The reason is, that these latter affect the body only—the mere animal man. But the power of God for salvation is spiritual, and relates, not to the animal, but to the *spiritual man.*

The intangible and almost unintelligible idea that some appear to have in reference to this matter is, that in order to conversion a man must place himself in a favorable position, make himself passive, and, "in the Lord's own good time," the power will come, make him a believer, and convert him. On this same intangible and unintelligible vague idea, modern Spiritualists have grafted the theory that, by sitting in circles, holding each other's hands, and becoming passive, the spirits will communicate with them. These deluded men have already gone into some of the most romantic, vague, and ridiculous absurdities ever known among intelligent and accountable beings. But spiritual power or influence does not take effect in the flesh and blood, but in the *spirit.* It is not a subtle influence, that is *felt* in the flesh, like electricity, cold, or heat, and that does not come through the mind. It is not a subtle influence, that you sit and watch for, as a Quaker preacher watching for the spirit to move him to speak, and that manifests itself first by some strange sensation in the flesh, or some queer feeling. The power of God to make believers and save men does not take effect in the flesh of men, but in the *spirit.* It is spiritual power, put forth in spiritual intelligence, to the human understanding.

As the intention is here to develop and discuss the subject pretty thoroughly, the inquiry may be put as follows: *Is the power that God exercises in making believers, and turning men to God, the power of intelligence addressed to the human understanding?* Or, *is it a subtle power of the Spirit, immediately from God, that takes effect on man, as heat, cold, or electricity, not in words, addressed to the human under-*

standing, that makes believers and turns men to God? It can not be this latter, for the following reasons:

1. If it is an *immediate* power or influence, it is without the *Mediator*, and men are made believers and turned to God, or converted without Christ, the Mediator between God and men. An immediate power or influence is a power or influence without a medium or mediator. The first objection to this theory is, then, that it sets aside the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, in turning men to God.

2. It sets aside the mission of the apostles, in making believers and turning men to God, and sets up a theory of making believers by an immediate power or influence without the apostles. This we know is not the Lord's way.

3. It sets aside the work of the Church entirely in making believers, and makes believers and turns men to God without the Church. In this theory the Church does not work with God at all in converting sinners.

4. It sets aside the Gospel entirely in making believers and turning men to God. The Gospel has nothing to do with it, performs no part in it, and is completely nullified by this theory, so far as converting sinners is concerned.

5. All Bibles, tracts, books, papers, and missionaries, as means for converting sinners, are swept away by this theory forever. If God, by an immediate power or influence, makes believers and turns men to God, all these means are a nullity.

6. All meetings for preaching to sinners, the preaching to them, and all talk to them, is sheer mockery if they are made Christians by an *immediate* power.

7. Human accountability is at an end, so far as being made believers and turning to God, if men are made believers and turned to God by an *immediate* influence. If the influence comes and makes a man a believer, the work is done. If it does not come and make him a believer, he

is not made a believer. Who is to blame if the power does not come? Who is to be praised if the power does come? This strikes out all idea of responsibility in believing or not believing. If a man is not made a believer it is not his fault, and the reason is not in him but in God, who *could* send the power and make him a believer, but *would not.*

It may be deliberately stated, and is here deliberately stated, that this theory of men being made believers and turned to God by an immediate influence, has done more harm and prevented more sincere and honest people from becoming Christians, than any other one error in the land, or even infidelity itself.

But that the power the Lord exercises in making believers and turning men to God, is the power of intelligence addressed to the human understanding, is clear from the following:

1. Because the Gospel is the power of God to salvation. The power in the Gospel is the power of intelligence. It contains intelligence, and is addressed to men and women, and, when they hear it, they are moved by this intelligence to believe and turn.

2. Paul says, 1 Cor. iv: 15, "I have begotten you through the Gospel." The literal meaning is, "I have made you believers through the Gospel." If they were begotten, or made believers through the Gospel, it was not by an immediate power without the Gospel. Through the Gospel, is by bringing the power of the intelligence in the Gospel to bear on their minds or understandings.

3. The Lord, in the commission, Matt. xxviii: 19, said, "Go, disciple all nations;" and, Mark xvi: 16, "Preach the Gospel to every creature;" and added, "He who believes." He who believes what? The Gospel—the intelligence preached. This shows that the Lord intended intelli-

gence to be brought to bear on their understandings, and for them to believe it.

4. Acts xxvi: 18, we find the words of Paul, where he says the Lord sent him to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." The Lord, then, through Paul, opened the eyes and *turned* the Gentiles, or converted them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. This he did by bringing the divine intelligence of the Gospel to bear on their minds.

5. Paul says, 1 Cor. i: 21, "It pleased God by the foolishness of *preaching* to save them that believe." This does not mean that it pleased God, by an immediate influence, to save men without preaching.

6. In all cases, in the time of the apostles, where persons were made believers and turned to the Lord, the Gospel and some one to preach it, were present. There is not an instance of one being converted without the Gospel.

7. James says, Jas. i: 18, "Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth." This is true of all who are begotten of God. It is by the word of truth, and not without the word of truth, that they are begotten of God.

8. Peter also says: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever." See 1 Pet. i: 23. How are persons "born again," or *begotten* again? "Not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by *the word of God*." Born, or begotten, used as a figure, means being *made believers*. This is done by the word of God.

9. Men are turned to God by Christ. "No man comes to the Father but by me," says the Lord. John xiv: 6 It is through him, as the Mediator between God and men.

The Almighty puts forth intelligence through Christ, through the apostles, through the Holy Spirit, and through

the Gospel, preached by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, to the understanding and heart of the sinner, makes him a believer, and turns him to the Lord. This work is, in some instances, ascribed to God; in some instances, to Christ; in some instances, to the apostles; in some instances to the Holy Spirit; and, in some instances, to the word But he who would express the whole, in one sentence, says, God does this work through Christ, the apostles, the Holy Spirit, and the Gospel. But it is the same, no matter whether ascribed to God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles, or the word. The power of God, of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit is put forth, through the Gospel, to save man.

But some one objects, saying, Do you think there is power in the mere word to quicken a sinner, dead in trespasses and sins, and turn him to God? Men of faith never say, "the *mere* word," nor "the *bare* word," when speaking of the word of God, which is quick and powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword, but call it *the word of God.* The power of God is in it, the power of Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit is in it. It would be precisely the same power if put forth *immediately.* Men must be deluded beyond description, if they can not see that it is neither more nor less than the power of God for salvation that is put forth in the Gospel. No one argues that sinners can be quickened *without* the power of God; but the Gospel is the power of God. That power, we have now fully seen, is not a subtle influence, that takes effect in the human system, without intelligence, but it is the power of intelligence addressed to the mind. Hence, not a convert was ever made to Christ, where the divine intelligence of the Gospel was not, in some way, conveyed to the mind. Nor was a convert ever made to any system of religion, either true or false, without conveying a knowledge of the same to the mind.

The converts, too, are the same in kind as the operators If the operators are Methodists, the converts are Methodists If the operators are Presbyterians, the converts are Presbyterians. If the operators are Christians, the converts are Christians, and nothing else. But who, in his right mind, believes that the Holy Spirit operates, by an immediate influence, on the hearts of the people in a Methodist meeting, and converts people to Methodism; then in a Baptist meeting, and makes Baptists; and then in a Presbyterian meeting, and makes Presbyterians? The power of the Spirit is in the Gospel, and when that is brought to bear on the minds of men, it leads them to believe on Christ, turn to God, and become *Christians*, and nothing else.

But some one is ready to inquire, Is there power in mere ink and paper? Certainly there is no power in mere ink and paper to turn a sinner to God, but there is power in the *divine intelligence*, communicated through signs of ideas, made in ink on paper—viz., the Gospel—the power of God to salvation. The power is not in the words, only as the intelligence is in and communicated through the words Why should any man doubt that there is power in the intelligence of the Gospel to turn men to God, when he has seen the power in the proclamation of a president or a general, move a nation? Why should sensible people doubt the power of intelligence, when they have seen a whole family stricken to the heart by a single dispatch of three lines, announcing the death of some beloved friend? If uninspired communications, about earthly things, can strike grief or joy through a whole family or community, why may not a proclamation from the Almighty Father of heaven and earth involving the destinies of the human race, take effect on the hearts of mankind?

But why argue that which men and women have seen all over the land? Who has not seen whole audiences melted

to tears under the preaching of the Gospel? Who has not seen the most wicked and stout-hearted men melted down, subdued and penitent as little children, under the overwhelming power of the Gospel, and, in scores, coming and yielding themselves to the authority of Heaven? What if teachers of religion have told the people that the word of God is a *dead letter*—that it is powerless, etc.? Have not men been seen visiting the people from house to house, warning them not to hear the man who preaches nothing but the word, thus contradicting all they have said? They know there is power in it, and dread that power. Why do not these men, claiming such wonderful spiritual illumination—the immediate influence of the Spirit—come out and put to flight the men who preach the word and nothing else? There is a good reason for it. They are weak as water before the men who preach the word and nothing else. Trepidation seizes their souls the moment you suggest a meeting with a man who preaches nothing but the word.

What did the Lord command to be preached?—"Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." "Preach the word." What were men required to believe? Of course, to believe what was preached—the Gospel. What were men to obey? Christ is the author of eternal salvation to them that *obey him*, and he will take vengeance on them who obey not the Gospel. What are men to hope for?—For all things which the Lord has promised. This places the responsibility where it is, and where it ought to be—on the part of man. God has given him the Gospel and ability to believe it. If he does not believe the Divine and credible testimony which God has given of his Son, as he has the ability to do, God can be just and good, and condemn him for not believing. God has laid commandments before man, just, reasonable, and easy, and given him ability to *obey;* and therefore if he does *not* obey, the Lord can be

just in condemning him for disobedience. This is in perfect accordance with all the invitations of the Gospel, and with our Lord's weeping over Jerusalem, and exclaiming, "How oft would I have gathered your children, but you would not." Again, he says, "You would not come to me that you might have life." And again: "He is not willing that any should perish, but all should come to repentance." "The Spirit says, Come; and the bride says, Come; and whoever will, let him take the water of life freely." "All the day long have I stretched forth my hand to a gainsaying and a disobedient people." These and many other expressions of the Scripture are foolishness with the idea of this direct converting power, of which we hear so much, without which a man can not believe, repent, or do any thing pleasing to God. All such invitations and expressions involve the idea that man is free; that he *can* turn to God, and may justly be condemned if he does not do it.

But if men can not believe, repent, and turn to God till an immediate power is sent to make them believers, how can they be justly condemned for their unbelief before the power comes to make them believers? They are no more to blame for not believing before this power comes, than a mill-wheel is for not turning before the power that turns it is put on. If two men are sitting on the same seat, and the power comes and makes one a believer, and leaves the other without the power to believe, no justice can blame the one left for not believing. This would not be leaving men without a cloak for their unbelief; but it is making a cloak for their unbelief where the Lord left them without one.

Does a man say he can not pray with the view here advocated—that if the Lord does not make believers, and turn sinners to God, by an immediate influence of the Spirit, the Lord can not answer prayer? In your empty theorizing, you have thus limited the Almighty and circumscribed him

to your narrow theory. Your faith, too, is limited to your narrow theory, so that you not only do not believe that God does answer prayer without your theory, or in any other way than you have marked out for him, but you do not believe *he can.* If your theory is exploded, therefore, you will not pray. A little more faith is what you need. You must believe that the Infinite One can answer the prayers of his saints, whether finite creatures can see how he does it or not. The Lord, the Jehovah, is not limited to the narrow conceptions of men, nor to their narrow theories and speculations for the channels of his operations. Men theorized many ages about the movements of the heavenly bodies before they understood their motion; but the Lord moved them on, not according to the theories of ignorant men, but according to the laws he had ordained. So he answers the prayers of the saints, not through the narrow channels prescribed in the theories of men, but according to his infinite wisdom and will He can and will perform his work, whether we can understand how he will do it or not.

The great matter for us to understand is, *how to perform our part of the work.* We must know how to do this, or we can not do it. The view taken in this discourse opens the way for the Gospel, the Church, the preachers, private members, books, tracts, missionaries, school-teachers—in one word, for human instrumentality, in every form, in making believers and turning the world to Christ, and views the sinner as an accountable being. The theory here opposed strikes out the Gospel the Church, the preachers, private members, books, tracts, missionaries and school-teachers—in one word, all human instrumentality in making believers and turning the world to Christ. This difference is wide enough—so wide that the view here opposed strikes down the Gospel entirely, so far as converting men is concerned. The only reason why it has not done more harm is, that

those who hold it, in spite of their theory, operate on the plan here advocated. Let us, then, preach the unsearchable riches of Christ, and make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which, from the beginning of the world, has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus the Christ.

SERMON, No. IV.

THEME.—THE DIFFERENT THINGS TO WHICH SALVATION IS ASCRIBED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TEXT.—"By grace are you saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."—EPH. ii: 8.

THIS text is selected, because it contains the clear statement concerning our salvation, that it is *by grace* and *through faith*. The theme for this discourse will be the different things to which salvation is ascribed in the New Testament, or the different things by which we are said to be saved, or justified. We are said to be saved, or justified, by faith, by grace, by his blood, by his life, by the Spirit, by works, by baptism, and, in one instance, the apostle exhorted his audience, saying, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." The leading purpose of this discourse will be to explain, illustrate, and show in what sense all these expressions are used; that they are perfectly consistent with each other, and with all the other Scriptures, and, at the same time, each one strictly true in itself. The intelligent Christian not only believes every one of them, but, in his religious meditations and conversations, has use for every one of these expressions. The well-instructed Christian man does not select a few verses, claim them as *his*, and build a religious system on them, but learns how to receive the *entire Scriptures* as one consistent and harmonious whole

He does not give out one class of scriptures to the Calvinist, another class to the Armenian, another to the Unitarian, and another to the Trinitarian, but receives *the whole* as from God, and for him.

Probably as convenient a place as any, at which to begin, will be to reconcile an expression in the words already quoted, with an expression, Jas. ii: 24. Paul says of our justification, Eph. ii: 9, "It is not of works, lest any man should boast." James says of our justification, that "by works a man is justified." How can it be true, as Paul asserts, that our justification is *not* of works, and yet true, as James says, that we *are* justified by works? The great Luther felt this difficulty so keenly that he repudiated the Epistle of James and decided it was not canonical. He thought the language of the two apostles utterly irreconcilable. He made up his mind that Paul was right—that justification is not of works—that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified in the sight of God. He saw no way to harmonize James with this, and decided that the Epistle of James was not of divine authority. But this will not do, if it was from a great man. There is no serious doubt among the authorities about the genuineness of the Epistle of James. The matter, then, is not to be settled in that way.

Some have tried to solve the difficulty by supposing that Paul was speaking of one kind of faith and James of another kind. But this will not do, for two reasons. In the first place, they were neither of them talking of faith at all. In the second place, we find no such expressions as "different kinds of faith" in the Bible. The Bible knows but *one faith*. As Pollock has, in substance, expressed it, All faith is the same in kind, though not the same in degree. Hence, we read of "much faith," "little faith," "great faith," "weak faith," "strong faith," "faith growing," etc., yet all the same in kind, but not the same in degree or quantity

If you had one pint of clean wheat, it would as certainly be *wheat* as if there were a thousand bushels, the same in kind, but not the same in quantity. Precisely so, from the first impression the truth makes on the heart, or from the first confidence the truth inspires in the human heart, up to the fullest assurance of faith ever attained by the most devout saint, it is faith, nothing but faith, the same in kind, though not the same in amount or degree. The matter is not to be settled, then, by any subtleties or speculations about faith.

How, then, is the matter to be settled? The difficulty is not about faith, but about *works*. Two different sorts of works are alluded to by these two writers—one sort, the works of the law of Moses; and the other, the works of the Gospel. Paul speaks of the works or the deeds of the law of Moses, and declares that our justification is "not of works"—the works of the law of Moses; or not by the deeds of the law, the deeds of the law of Moses. To this James would have assented as heartily as Paul. But James is not speaking of the works, or deeds of the law of Moses at all, but of the works or deeds of the Gospel of Christ—"good works, which God has ordained that we should walk in them," as Paul expresses it, Eph. ii: 10, and says, "By works"—the good works of the Gospel—"a man is justified, and not by faith only." To this Paul would most freely have assented. It is simply true that a man is not justified by the works of the law of Moses, but the works of the Gospel; or, to express it differently, that a man is not justified by keeping or obeying the law of Moses, but he is justified by obeying the Gospel of Christ; or, he is not justified by the law, but by the Gospel—not justified by Moses, but by Jesus.

But now, attention is invited to another class of expressions, more directly in accordance with the theme in hand. Heb. xi: 7, Noah's salvation is ascribed to faith. In the

same verse his salvation is ascribed to an ark. 1 Pet. iii. 20, his salvation is ascribed to water. How can it be true, as said in one place, that he was saved by faith; true, as said in another place, that he was saved by an ark; and yet true, as said in another place, that he was saved by water? Shall one man preach that he was saved by faith *alone*, another that he was saved by an ark *alone*, and yet another that he was saved by water *alone?* This would be absurd. Nothing can be clearer than that, if he was saved by faith *alone*, he was not saved by the ark at all. The moment it is established that he was saved by faith *alone*, it is established that the statement that he was saved by an ark is not true. It is, at the same time, established that the statement that he was saved by water is not true. Faith alone, is faith without any thing else. If he was saved by faith *alone*, he was saved by faith without any thing else, and, of course, without the ark or water. But this is not true. It is true that he was saved by faith, but it is equally true that he was saved by an ark. It is also true that he was saved by water, but certainly not by the ark alone, nor by the *water alone*. The antediluvians had water, as much water as Noah, but no faith nor ark—the *water alone*—and they were all lost. We should be careful about taking things alone which the Lord has joined to something else, or separating that which the Lord has joined together.

It is not only true that Noah believed God, and was saved by faith, but in his conduct we have a clear example of the strength of faith necessary to save, or when faith is strong enough to save. He believed God, and was "moved with religious fear." Do you inquire to what extent he was moved? His faith was strong enough to move him to obey God; to do what God had commanded; to prepare an ark. When faith is strong enough to move men and women to obey God; to do what he commands them to do, in order

to salvation; it is strong enough to save them. When it is not strong enough to lead them to obey God, it is not strong enough to save them, but simply strong enough to make them miserable if the Lord should summon them to judgment. Noah believed God, and his belief was strong enough to create within him religious fear, and lead him to obey God, or prepare an ark, to the saving of himself and family. But he was not saved when he believed God, nor yet when he prepared an ark, so that the faith and ark *alone* did not save him. He believed God for the space of one hundred and twenty years, and performed the great work of preparing the ark. During this time, too, he had done a vast amount of preaching, for he was "a preacher of righteousness." See 2 Pet. ii: 5. Still, he was not saved! What did he lack to save him? He had the faith, the ark, the righteousness, and was evidently a praying man, as all holy men are, but was still not saved. There was one item still wanting to complete God's plan to save him, and that was "water," and, in that case, a drop was not "as good as an ocean."

Another beautiful thing opens up here. That is, that what man can do himself, the Lord requires him to do, and when he comes to what he can not do himself, the Lord does that for him. Noah could believe God. This the Lord required him to do. He could prepare an ark. This, too, the Lord commanded him to do. He could preach righteousness and pray. All this the Lord required him to do. But he could not provide the water for his salvation. The Lord did this for him. By means of his faith, the Lord moved him to prepare the ark, and by means of the ark and the water, the Lord saved Noah, not by faith alone, nor the ark alone, nor water alone, but by faith, the ark, and the water combined.

What a scene it must have created when the time had

expired! Noah and his wife, his three sons and their wives, entered the ark and took in of every living creature as God had commanded. The Lord shut him in. This was his separation from "the world that then was." He had preached the last sermon, given the last exhortation, sent up to heaven the last prayer for that people, heaved the last sigh over them, and shed the last tears for them. He had given them up to their doom. The wrath of God had been long kindling. His goodness had long been despised and his mercy rejected. Nor did the number involved in sin prevent the execution of the guilty. Some say, if certain teaching is true, the great mass of humanity will be lost. This might have been said truthfully in the days of Noah, and in reference to his preaching. But his preaching was true, no matter how few were saved according to it. He was a preacher of righteousness, and none but those who received his preaching and lived according to it were saved. In the civil governments of the world, if the number found guilty is very great in proportion to the whole population, the authorities can not inflict the punishment. The popular feeling will revolt at it, while they will stand it to punish a few. But, in the divine government, the *guilty* are punished, no matter whether *many* or *few*. The arm of Jehovah is strong enough, and his justice searching enough, and the guilty shall not go unpunished.

When the appointed hour had come, the engines of destruction were opened upon the world, and the mighty judgments of the Holy, the Just, and the True were let loose. Fearful and terrible clouds made their appearance, spreading over the entire canopy above. The lightnings played across the heavens and horrific thunders rolled. The fountains of the great deep were broken up. The windows of heaven were opened wide. The massive waters surged. The guilty world stood condemned before God, and the executioner had come.

There was no escape. Down they were hurled forever, and their destruction recorded for an admonition to the nations to come. By faith, the ark, and the water—the same water made a means of destruction to the wicked—the precious treasure, the few, the small church, were safely carried over to the new world. Take warning, if you boast that you belong to the "big church," by what became of *it* in the time of Noah. Let men be warned; the Lord will judge the world in righteousness.

It is not, however, desirable to hear man preach about Adam, Noah, Abraham; the Antediluvians, the Egyptians, and Jews, and have nothing for the people of our time. To that, then, which relates more directly to the men of our day, attention must be directed. What has the Lord said for *us*, for *our* salvation? This is what more immediately concerns us. Paul has a general statement to this effect, Rom. v: 1, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." This is a general statement, and relates alike to the justification of every person reconciled to God under the Gospel dispensation. If there were not another word about it in the New Testament, a man might stand on this and maintain that every man justified by Christ at all, is justified by faith. That, what is aimed at here, may be more clearly understood, it may be stated that it is not necessary that faith should be mentioned in every instance; but where we find a mention of justification, or salvation, whether faith is mentioned or not, it is by faith in every instance. Not that a person is justified or saved without faith. It is present in the justification of every one whether mentioned or not. For instance, we read of the justification of three thousand on Pentecost, but in the whole account it is not said that they were justified by faith. Yet, every one of them were justified by faith. The same is true of the five thousand mentioned in the third

chapter of Acts, those mentioned in the eighth, ninth, tenth, sixteenth, and every other chapter where we read of persons being justified. They were all justified by faith, and so were all who have been justified at all. Not one has been or can be justified without faith. This is true, also, of justification by grace. The one utterance, that we are saved by grace, is general. It is no special utterance for a special case, but it is general and for all cases. No matter whether grace is mentioned in every case or not; still, in every case, justification or salvation is by grace. No man is saved without grace. It is present in the justification of every man, whether mentioned in every case or not.

The same is true of the blood of Christ. We are said to be "justified by his blood." Rom. v: 9. This, like the examples just given, is a general expression, and relates to the justification of every man justified by Christ at all. It is no special case, for a special person or persons, but a general expression relating to all cases of justification by Christ. No matter if it is true that we are not told, Acts ii: 37 and 38, that the three thousand were justified by his blood; no matter if this is not mentioned in connection with the justification in another case in the New Testament; the one general statement, that we are justified by his blood, shows that the blood of Christ, as the efficacious cause, is present in the justification of every person. Not a soul is justified without it. It is never omitted. The same is true of the life of Christ and the Spirit. We are justified by the Spirit and by his life.

So far, not a man of any church demurs. Is the inquiry made, Why be thus particular? The answer is that there is a hard place a little ahead, and the object is to get over it The same principle indorsed in what has just been said, will assist us in that hard place. Peter says, 1 Pet. iii: 21, "Baptism doth also now save us." This is a general state-

ment, not of a special few, but of all saved or justified. They are saved by baptism. It is present in the justification of every person. It is never omitted. Some objections must now be considered.

Too much is made of baptism. That is not the trouble. You may say it is the *least commandment* if you know it to be so, and no argument will be instituted against you. But then the question comes up, Is it a commandment of God at all? All parties exclaim, "Certainly it is." What is to be done with a commandment of God? There is but one thing that can righteously be done with a commandment of God. That one thing is to *obey it.* No matter whether a great commandment or a small one, it is right and infallibly safe to obey it. This no one denies or can deny. Though the people do not put it on a par, in value, with the grace of God or the blood of Christ, yet all the commandments of God are important in their place, and should be obeyed. To fill out the system the Lord has been pleased to ordain to save men, it is as indispensable to insert the items appearing to man to be of the least value, as those appearing to be of the greatest value.

But now, it is said, too much is made of baptism! How much do our religious neighbors make of it? So much that they can not, according to their standard authorities, receive one soul without it. This statement is made in reference to what they hold to be baptism, without any regard to the action. Or, what is meant is, that not a church of any note will receive a member without what it calls baptism. This remark is not made of every irresponsible preacher, who will do any thing, and for whom no church is responsible, but responsible men, acting in accordance with their standard authorities, or acting legitimately. Not a church, then, thus acting will receive a member without what it esteems to be baptism. No matter how honest the person is, how strong

his faith, how much he has repented, how much he prays, nor how great a change he has experienced, he can not get into a church, into full membership, without what it esteems baptism. Essential or not, fundamental or not, whether the Lord receives him or not, without what the church calls baptism he can not legitimately enter. There stands what they call baptism at the entrance, and no man can enter without it.

How essential has the Lord made baptism? Precisely as essential as these churches have made it. He will not receive a person into his church without what he calls baptism. His church is his kingdom, and who a man is, what he is, or where he is, may not be known, but without baptism he is not in the church, body, or kingdom of Christ. Precisely so; who a man is, what he is, or where he is, if he has not been baptized he is not in the Baptist church. The same is true of all other churches, except that some of them call sprinkling or pouring baptism. Who a man is, what he is, or where he is, is not here explained, and may not be known, but he is legitimately in no Protestant church if he has not received what is called baptism.

Do they say that persons may be pardoned and the Lord receive them without baptism? Then they differ from the Lord, and require something more than the Lord does, before they will receive them. But who is received of the Lord? Every justified or pardoned person. His terms of justification, or remission of sins, are precisely the same as his terms of admission into his body or kingdom. He receives into his kingdom every justified person and no other. In Christ all are new creatures. Out of Christ there are no new creatures. These modern churches, according to their own showing, are more uncharitable (using this word in *their sense*—not the true) than the Lord, for they try to prove that the Lord will receive unbaptized

persons, while they will not. In other words, they reject persons because they have not received what they call baptism, but maintain that the Lord receives them. What reason they have for not receiving persons, when they say the Lord receives them, it would be difficult to conceive.

Is it objected that there is too much preaching on baptism? The Lord says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." "But *born of water* is not an allusion to baptism," says a man. Then all the ancient fathers were mistaken, for they all understood it to be an allusion to baptism. Then the entire church of Rome has always misapplied it, for that church has always expounded it to be an allusion to baptism. The Greek church has so expounded it. Luther, Calvin, and Wesley so understood and applied it. It is quoted and applied to baptism in the Methodist Discipline and the Presbyterian Confession of Faith. It is so applied in all the standard authorities of all the principal churches in the world. There is no authority of any note that denies it. No matter who a man is, what he is, or where he is, "Except he is born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God;" and "born of water" is an allusion to baptism. No matter how much greater the value of the part relating to the Spirit than the part relating to the water, there stand "the water and the Spirit," in the same sentence, from the lips of Jesus, and the unequivocal utterance, that "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." It is not except a man be born of the Spirit he can not enter, nor except he be born of the water he can not enter, but "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." No matter how much more important the work of the Spirit, how much greater or more valuable, still there we find *water*, in the

same sentence, connected by the conjunction "and" with it, and except a man be born of "water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

Nor is this, as some have supposed, two births—one of water and one of the Spirit—but one birth, of water and of the Spirit, begotten by the Spirit and born of water, as the child is begotten by the father and born of the mother, or, laying aside the figure, made a believer by the Spirit, through the Gospel, and baptized. Except a man shall be begotten through the Gospel, or made a believer by the Gospel, and immersed, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. We are said to be begotten by the "word of truth," by the apostles, by the Spirit, and by God. It requires but a small amount of intelligence to see that this is all the same thing. It is of God, through Christ, the apostles, the Holy Spirit that spoke through the apostles, and through the word spoken. The literal of it is, that God makes believers through Christ, through the apostles, through the Spirit, and through the word preached and heard. The man thus made a believer is, figuratively, said to be *begotten of God*, and when baptized he is, figuratively, said to be "born of water." The literal meaning of the passage is, Except a man believes and is immersed, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. It requires belief, repentance, and immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, to constitute the new birth, or what is meant by being born again.

"But you preach too much on baptism," says an objector. True, there is much preaching on it, but there is an apology for preaching so much on it. When faith is mentioned, preachers of all denominations approve of it. All approve when repentance is preached. All help with prayer, and so of many other things; but mention *baptism*, and down go their hands; they step back and begin to tell that it is not

essential—that many have gone to heaven without it, etc. Of course, those determined that every item in the Lord's process shall be inserted where the Lord ordained it, will have to preach much more on baptism than if all the preachers would do their part. But there is a way in which those weary of hearing so much on baptism can change the programme. Let them turn and preach that faith is not essential; that repentance or prayer is not essential; and tell how many they have known, good and pious, that have gone to heaven without faith, or repentance, or prayer, and they will soon hear less on baptism and more on these other items.

The determination now is to maintain the Gospel, the whole Gospel, and nothing but the Gospel—every item, from the least to the greatest, from the first to the last. That which men ignore, neglect, or oppose, will be most assiduously defended. There are to be no encroachments on the kingdom of God. Every item is to be inserted where the Lord has ordained it. The grace must have its place. The faith must be faithfully inserted, maintained, and defended where the Lord inserted it. The blood of Christ must be most sacredly guarded and maintained in its divinely ordained place, and so of every other item. If any man desires to know precisely the extent of the dangerous doctrine advocated in this discourse, it would be as well to let him know it here as in another part of it. It is, then, that not an item in the Gospel may be ignored, omitted, or opposed; that God will strike the preacher's name out of the book of life, and his part out of the holy city, who dares to strike out an item of the Gospel, small or great, no matter whether grace, faith, the blood of Christ, the life of Christ, the Spirit, works, or *baptism*. These are important matters with which we are dealing, and not to be trifled with.

To the man who desires to understand, it is a matter of profound interest to note the chain in the divine procedure

in his way of saving man. Where, then, did it have its commencement? In God's infinite goodness. His infinite goodness, so to speak, moved him to put forth his last effort to save man; his infinite grace or favor brought the Savior to the world; his blessed mission among men followed; then followed the mission of the apostles; then came the mission of the Holy Spirit to inspire the apostles; then followed the preaching of the Gospel by the Holy Spirit through the apostles; this was followed by the hearing of the Gospel and its being believed; this belief of the Gospel changes the heart and leads to repentance; this is followed by the confession of the Lord Jesus; then comes the immersion into his death; this brings the man to the blood of Jesus, that cleanses from or washes away sin; then follows the impartation of the Spirit, to strengthen and comfort the saint; then follow all the blessings of the church. Now, let any man look back over this list and tell us which item may be stricken out. It will not do to strike out the infinite goodness, for then not another item would have followed, and there would have been no salvation for man. We may not come one step further and strike out the grace of God, or the favor that brought the Savior to the world, for then no mission of Christ, of the apostles, and of the Holy Spirit would have followed, and the whole system would have been defeated. So, if you come one link further down the chain, and strike out the mission of Christ, all below it would be cut off. We would have no apostles, no Holy Spirit sent, no Gospel preached, no faith, and no salvation. So, it will not do to strike out the apostolic mission, or the mission of the Holy Spirit, as then we would have no Gospel and no faith. Nor will it do to strike out faith, repentance, confession, baptism, or the blood of Christ, as all below the item stricken out would be lost.

It is not the grace alone, faith alone, blood alone, Spirit

alone, life alone, works alone, or baptism alone that saves or justifies, nor does any one of these save or justify in the same sense as any other one. In other words, no two of these perform the same part in our salvation or justification. The part that the grace of God performs in our justification is that it brings our Lord, the Gospel, and the entire new institution to man. Without this part, then, there would be no justification for any man. Faith performs an entirely different part, without which we could not be saved. It brings the authority of God to bear on our minds, reveals to us our condemnation on account of sins, changes our hearts, and leads us to repentance and confession. Baptism performs no such part as this at all, produces no change in the heart or life, but changes the relation, initiates the man, previously changed in heart and life into a new state or relation, into the body of Christ. It transfers the man into the new state or relation. In this new state he comes to the blood of Christ, which performs another part of the work, without which he would be lost. It takes away his sin, cleanses or washes him from the guilt of sin. The Holy Spirit, his advocate in the Church, announces him justified, or advocates him a justified person, or one not guilty. After he is a Christian, he is justified, in the sense of approval, by good works "which God has ordained that we should walk in them." In short, the favor of God brings the justification to man, the faith changes his heart and life, thus preparing him for it, and baptism transfers him into the new relation, the blood of Christ cleanses him from sin, and the Holy Spirit advocates him as a justified man. God, then, justifies him through his grace, which brings salvation to all men, through the faith which prepares man in heart and life for salvation, and through immersion, which transfers him into the new relation, and through the blood of Christ, which cleanses him from all past sins. God puts forth his

power through his goodness, his grace, the Savior, the apostles, the inspiring Spirit in the apostles, the word, the faith of the sinner, his repentance, confession, immersion, the blood of Christ, the impartation of the Spirit, the prayers, the communion—in one word, the entire agencies, means, and instrumentalities which the Lord has ordained—and saves the sinner. The salvation, coming through these agencies, means, and instrumentalities, is divine, from God; and the sinner, when saved, owes as much gratitude to God as if he had been saved by an immediate exertion of omnipotent power.

When the favor of God that brought salvation to man is the theme of the preacher, and he is speaking of the part that the favor of God performs in saving man, he says he is saved by the favor of God, but with the understanding that faith, the blood of Christ, etc., are in their places; but when he is speaking of faith, and the part it performs in saving the sinner, he says he is saved by faith, with the understanding that every item is in its place. When the blood of Christ is the theme, and he is looking to the part performed by the blood, he says we are saved by his blood, with the understanding that each of the other items is in its place. In precisely the same way, when baptism is the theme of the preacher, and he is looking at the part it performs, as the initiatory rite into the new institution, he says baptism saves us; but if he desires to state the matter more fully, he says, through his grace, the faith, baptism, and the blood of Christ, God saves us. But when he makes yet a fuller statement, he says, by his goodness, which moved him to send the Savior; by his favor, which brought the Lord from heaven to man, with salvation; by his Son, our Savior; by the apostles; by the Spirit of inspiration that spoke in them, by the word spoken; by the belief of the truth, the repentance, confession, immersion, his blood, his Spirit, his life, the

Church, and all the means ordained, God saves us; and we will give all the blessing, the glory and honor, to him, forever and ever.

This style of speaking is common everywhere, and none but weak men would ever think of isolating any one of these items from all the others, and arguing that we are saved by it alone. Such an argument would be not only weak, but as silly as the man who would argue, that because a man is said to have cut down a tree with an ax, that he did it without a handle in the ax; or because a man is said to have plowed the ground with a span of horses, that he did it without a plow; or because a man is said to have traveled a day with a staff, that he traveled without shoes. The circumstance that man is saved by grace does not prove that it is without faith, without the blood of Christ, without baptism, or without any thing else which the Lord requires. In the text, we are said to be saved "by grace through faith," and not by grace *without* faith, nor by faith *without* grace, nor "by grace through faith," *without* the blood of Christ, nor *without* baptism; but, as already shown, the grace, in its own place, did its part, the faith, in its own place, did its part, the blood of Christ, in its own place, did its part, and the baptism, in its own place, did its part. Without the grace or favor of God, the Gospel, with its salvation, would never have been brought to man. Without faith, the heart of the sinner would not be changed; he would not be led to repentance, to confess or yield to be a servant of the Lord. Without the baptism, or the immersion, he would not be initiated or baptized into Christ, into one body; and without the blood of Christ he would not be cleansed from sins, or pardoned. The grace brings salvation, the faith prepares the man in heart and life to receive it, the immersion initiates him into Christ, the body, the Church, the blood of Christ cleanses him from the guilt of sin, and thus he is saved, not by grace

alone, faith alone, baptism alone, or the blood of Christ alone, but by grace, through faith, baptism, and the blood of Jesus. God saves him, and the gratitude he owes to God is as great as if he had saved him without an agency, means, or instrumentality. The saved man, if he is intelligent, does not give the glory to the grace, the faith, the immersion, or the blood, but to God, who gave the grace, the faith, the immersion, and the blood, and saved him by his grace, through faith, baptism, and the blood of Christ.

If illustration can make the subject plainer, try one more illustration: A man falls into the river, and is likely to drown. Two men see him struggling in the water, jump into a skiff, and hasten to him, and, before he sinks, push out an oar, and call to him to seize the oar and save himself. He grasps the oar; they pull him into the skiff, bring him to the shore, and save him from drowning. The question now is immediately asked, How was that man saved from drowning? In one instance, it is said two men saved him. In another conversation, it is said he was saved by a skiff. In another circle, it is said he was saved by an oar. On another occasion, it is said he saved himself. How is all this? Are these contradictions? Certainly not. How, then, is it? It was not said, in any instance, that he was saved by the two men alone, the skiff alone, the oar alone, or his own act alone. How, then, was it? The man who said two men saved him was looking at the agency of the two men and the part they performed, without which he would not have been saved, and truly said the two men saved him. The man who said he was saved by a skiff, was looking at the part performed by that agent, without which he would not have been saved, and very justly said he was saved by the skiff. The person who said he was saved by an oar, was looking at the part performed by that agent, without which he would not have been saved, and properly

said the oar saved him. The one who said he saved himself, was looking at his important act, taking hold of the oar, without which he would not have been saved. But, to put the whole together, instead of two men *alone* saving him, the skiff *alone*, an oar *alone*, his act *alone*, the two men, with a skiff, an oar, and the man's own act in taking hold of the oar, saved him from drowning. So it is not grace *alone*, nor faith *alone*, nor baptism *alone*, nor the blood of Christ *alone*, that saves the sinner; but God, by grace, through faith, immersion, and the blood of Jesus, saves the sinner.

There is no question about what God *can* do—whether he *can* save the sinner without grace, without faith, without baptism, or without the blood of Christ. Men of faith, intelligence, and reverence for the Lord, do not discuss any such questions. They are questions for skeptics. The question is not about what God *can do*, but about what *he does;* and that, too, not in an extraordinary case, an exceptional or an unusual case—not what he does with infants, idiots, or persons who never hear and never can hear the Gospel, but where the Gospel is preached; in the legitimate administration of the Gospel; *how he does* save the sinner. This is the question. Every one is saved by grace. Not a man, in the legitimate administration of the Gospel, is saved without the grace of God; but every one saved at all is saved *by it*, but not by it *alone*. So, in the legitimate administration of the Gospel, every one saved at all, is saved by faith, but not by faith *alone;* by immersion, but not by immersion *alone;* by the blood of the covenant, but not by the blood *alone*.

Does any one inquire about infants, idiots, and those who never hear the Gospel, and never can? They come not within the scope of this discourse. This discourse is for Gospel subjects, and not for such as can not be Gospel subjects.

The Lord has not set us to puzzling our brain about infants and idiots, who can not understand the Gospel or believe. They are not Gospel subjects. The Lord will take care of them without the Gospel or Church. We can do nothing religiously for them. There is but one thing that can be done for the heathen, and that is not to try to frame a plan of salvation for them *without the Gospel*, but do all in our power to send the Gospel to every kindred, and tribe, and tongue, and people. Send the Gospel forth to all the nations of the earth, as it is, indeed, the wisdom of God and the power of God. All we can do to save men, must be done *by the Gospel*, and not *without it*. We can not save men *without the Gospel*. What the Lord intends to do for infants, idiots, and pagans, without the Gospel, he will do without any regard to our opinions, views, or theories touching that matter, and without *our aid*. We have no hand in that matter. Our whole duty is in the Gospel plan—in a legitimate administration of the Gospel. He has not called on us to help him save unconscious infants or idiots, who can not believe the Gospel or obey it. He will take care of these whether we have correct views of it or not; whether we know how he will do it or not. Officious priests are very forward to help where the Lord never invited them, and even theorize *how* the Lord will do things, where they can do nothing. The preacher of Jesus can do nothing toward saving a person where there *can be no faith*. Where there can be no faith, it is in the hand of God, the righteous judge of all the earth, who will do right. Even where there is faith, and *can be no obedience*, the preacher can do nothing—all is in the hands of the Lord.

In every case where a soul is lost, there must be a point somewhere beyond which there is no turning. By some means, the popular view has settled down in the conclusion

that death is that point. Hence, some have been singing, and others are yet—

"While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

But no man can prove that this is true. That no sinner beyond death can return, is doubtless true. But that at *any time* this side of death the sinner can turn to God and be saved, no man can prove. God can be vindicated—be shown to be as holy, just, and good, and refuse to receive the man who has sinned against him, rejected all his mercy, and despised all his grace, *till he can not obey the Gospel*, as if he would refuse to receive him when he desired to turn just after death. When a man refuses to obey the Gospel till he can not, refuses to come to the Lord till he *can not come according to the Gospel*, it is disloyal in the preacher of the Gospel to promise him salvation *without obeying the Gospel*, and preach at the funeral that the man who *lived and died without obeying the Lord Jesus is saved.* What if a man did express a desire to be saved just before he died? Did not the rich man in hades express a desire to be saved just after he died? Neither obeyed God while he could. When his time was out he *could not.* When he could not come according to the Gospel, the door of the kingdom, body or Church, was shut, no matter whether before death or at death. If a man will not come to the Savior while he has health and strength to obey the Gospel; to come to God according to his law; if he will not become a Christian, or a disciple of Christ, while he *can*, shall any man of God stand up and tell him that the Lord will receive him when he *can not* become a Christian, according to the law of God? This is a case in which the enemy tries preachers of the Gospel. Many times, by appeals to their sympathies, he overcomes their judgments and induces them to forsake the Gospel.

It is not the business of preachers, in visiting the sick or preaching about the dead, to decide who will go to heaven, or who has gone there. The business of preachers is to teach men and women, in life and while they *can*, how to become Christians or disciples of Christ, and how to live to the glory of God; but not to save people who have sinned away all their strength and time with which they could have obeyed the Gospel and served God, but have never done it. In other words, they can do nothing toward saving any human being who can not obey the Gospel. It is doing an injury to man, to teach that persons can come to the Lord as long as there is breath in them. No man can prove this. While persons can come according to the Scriptures, obey the Gospel, be born of water and of the Spirit, they can become Christians and be saved. When the Lord puts his hand on them, cuts them down, so that *they can not obey the Gospel*, the time is past, the harvest is ended. Trifle not, then, with the eternal matters of the soul, but "save yourselves from this untoward generation." Rest not in the delusion that you will call for mercy when dying, and be saved. If you love not God now, and will not serve him; if you love not the Gospel, and will not obey it; love not the people of God, and will not walk with them; you need not expect all this alienation to be done away in a moment, when you come to a dying hour. If you prefer the wicked for your associates now, select them and walk with them; if you turn your back on God now, his cause, and people, he will turn his back on you then. Turn, then, accept the great salvation, and live.

SERMON, No. V.

THEME.—MEN MUST DO SOMETHING TO BE SAVED

TEXT.—"Not every one who says Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven."—MATT. vii: 21.

IN our Lord's introductory address, usually styled "the Sermon on the Mount," he laid down the ground on which he discriminated between *wise* and *foolish* men. "Those," he says, "who hear these sayings of mine and *do them*," I will liken to *wise men*. "Those who hear these sayings of mine," says he, "and *do them not*, I will liken to *foolish men*." The wise he compares to a man who dug deep and founded his house on a rock. The rains descended, the winds blew, and the floods came and beat on that house, and it fell not, for it was founded on a rock. The foolish he compares to a man who built his house on the sand. The rains descended, the winds blew, and the floods came and beat on that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it. The difference between the wise and foolish was not that one class *heard* while the other did not, nor that one class *believed* while the other did not, but that one class *did* what was required in the teaching of Jesus, while the other *did not*. The whole matter turned on *doing* and *not* doing what the Lord commanded. The matter of being accounted wise or foolish did not turn on the orthodoxy of their views, on Trinitarianism or Unitarianism, Calvinism or Armenianism,

but on *doing the will of God.* The matter does not turn on some abstruse question of theology, metaphysical distinction, or speculation of learned men, nor does it turn on the understanding of learned, difficult, and mysterious terms, requiring great depth of profound learning, but on *doing* or *not doing* the commandments of God.

Every man ought to be most devoutly thankful that the question of our being put down with the wise or foolish does not turn on something beyond our control, but on something over which we have control. It does not turn on understanding something that we can not comprehend, or even something difficult to comprehend, nor on receiving some influence that we can not obtain, nor on our Savior or our heavenly Father doing something that he will not do, nor yet on our doing something that we can not do, but on our *doing* commandments that are not grievous, but easy—something that we *can do,* and perfectly in the bounds of reason. The question does not turn on what we think, how we feel, what we have experienced, our dreams, the sights we have seen, or the strange sounds we have heard, but on *doing the will of God.* Those who *do* his commandments shall enter by the gates into the city and have a right to the tree of life.

The theme of this discourse is, therefore, *doing* and *not doing* the will of God; or, in other words, it will be shown that the Lord requires man to do *something* in order to be saved. He does not save men in doing nothing. It will not be shown in this discourse what that *something is* that a man must do in order to being saved; but the abstract proposition that he must do *something* will be discussed. To illustrate the main principle involved, three different theories will be here stated:

1. One of these theories starts out by affirming that "God unchangeably ordains whatever comes to pass." This is fol-

lowed by the additional affirmation that "the number of the elect is so definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished." If a preacher of respectability, talent, and fair acquirements were to preach the theory just stated for twelve months, in any community in this country, he would find a few who would believe it. What would be the result when they believed it? They would sit down, fold their hands, and do nothing. Inquire, Why is it that they do nothing? They will reply, We have no ability to do any thing. God ordained whatever comes to pass before the world was, fixed the destinies of all men and angels, and we are waiting for him to solve the problem, and, in his good time, show whom he has elected. Thus these continue to do nothing, waiting for the Lord to show whether they are of the elect or not. If they are of the elect, they believe that the Lord, in his own good time, will bring them in by his irresistible power and save them. If they are not of the elect, they can not be saved, though they may pray and fast in sackcloth and ashes till the trumpet sounds.

2. Another theory starts out differently from the one just described, maintaining that salvation is conditional; that God saves men on the condition of faith. But it immediately proceeds to inform us that a man can not believe till God sends power or influence from himself to the heart, and gives him faith or makes him a believer. The advocate of this theory takes great pains to prove that faith is an *immediate gift of God.* Many, on hearing this theory, believe it. What is the result when they believe it? Precisely the same as in the other case; they sit down, fold their hands, and do nothing. Inquire of them, Why is it that you do nothing? The reply is, that we can do nothing till the Lord gives us faith. We are waiting for the direct gift of God—faith; and when the Lord gives us faith we expect to be saved on the *condition of faith.*

3. Another theory starts out with the proposition that God will save all men ultimately. But few men ever get fully settled in the belief of this theory. Many will tell you that they have *tried* to believe it, that they *wanted* to believe it, but never *could* believe it without some lingering doubt. They generally come as near to it as the man who argued it dogmatically for an hour, but concluded by saying that he would give his oxen to *know it*. What is the result where men make the nearest approach to believing this theory? The same as in the other cases; they sit down, fold the hands, and do nothing. Approach them and ask, Why is it that you do nothing? They reply, that we can do nothing in this matter of our salvation, nor need we, for the Lord will save us all, whether we do any thing or not, whether we belong to any church or not, or even believe on the Lord that died for us.

Now, here are three theories, starting out very differently, but resulting in the same thing—leading those who believe them to do nothing. Large books have been written and read on these theories, and men have studied them till their heads ached, and then were grieved that they did not understand them. They have said to themselves, "If I can not be saved until I understand these theories, I can never be saved." The truth is, that it is useless to trouble a man's brain with these or any similar theories. No matter whether you can see through them or not, whether you can understand them or not, any theory that leads men and women to *disobey God* is wrong. Any theory that leads men and women to *do nothing*, when God has commanded them to *do something*, is sinful. The theories alluded to, and many more that might be mentioned, puzzle the minds of men, cause them to study and wonder, but lead the people all the time to do nothing—to disobey the Lord. These are unquestionably of evil tendency and sinful. They not only

have no salvation in them, but are in the way of the salvation of men.

But the reader is now ready to demand Scripture—that he does not desire to trouble himself with the theories of men. To the Scriptures, then, shall reference be made. Mark x: 17, there is an account of one coming to the Savior and saying, "Good Teacher, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" If the Lord had intended to teach that *men can not do any thing*, it is a little remarkable that he did not insert it in his reply to this man. He would have simply replied, "You can not do any thing." This would have settled the matter in all time to come; but he did not so reply. The Lord said, "You know the commandments," at the same time repeating them, as given by Moses. The man replied, "All these have I kept from my youth." The Lord replied, "One thing you lack." What was that *one thing?* "It was grace," says a man. No, sir, it was not grace. The Lord had extended to him the same grace as he had to all other men. "It was the influence of the Spirit," says another. That can not be, for the Lord would not withhold from him the influence of the Spirit, and then cut him off from eternal life for the want of that influence. Not only so, but the influence of the Spirit was doing as much to save him as any other man. It was something which the Lord required the *man to do himself.* When he heard what it was, he concluded that *he would not do it.* The Lord then decided (though it is said "he loved him") that he would not have him for his disciple. Do you say it was hard or uncharitable to reject him simply because he would not do that *one thing?* You ought not, for in refusing to do that one thing, he made a square issue with the Lord. The Lord required one thing to be done. He refused. This was clearly refusing to be governed by the Lord. On this account, the Lord rejected him, and for the

same reason he would reject any other man or an angel of heaven. He would not *do* what was required in the sayings of Jesus, and the Lord likened him to a foolish man who built his house on the sand. The last account of that man is that he went *away sorrowful.* The question of his acceptance turned on his doing or refusing to do that *one thing.* Be careful how you refuse to do even one thing commanded by the Lord.

Take another example. On the great Pentecost, the apostle, for the first time, opened out under the last commission—delivered his first discourse after the full endowment from heaven, as Jesus had promised, to guide his apostles into all truth, and, at the close, a cry came up from the multitude, from the lips of those who heard and were pierced in their hearts, "Men, brethren, what shall we *do?*" Here, as in the case of the man just mentioned, the very first thing is the question about *doing.* Why did not the apostles tell them that they could not do any thing? Because it was not true. They could do something. The apostle proceeded, and, in one sentence, told them what to do. They did what he commanded, and the Lord received them—likened them to wise men, who heard his sayings and did them. There were many present on that day who heard, but refused to do what the Lord commanded. The Lord did not receive one of these. He counted them foolish men.

Take one more example, as found, Acts ix. Young Saul was on his way to Damascus, persecuting the saints. On arriving near to the city, he and his associates had such a visitation as they had never witnessed before. A great light from heaven shone round about them, and a voice was heard, exclaiming, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Young Saul lifted his voice, and inquired, "Who art thou, Lord?" The Lord replied, "I am Jesus of Nazareth,

whom thou persecutest." Saul again inquired, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to *do?*" Here comes the same question about *doing*. Why did not the Lord reply, "You can not do any thing?" For the best reason in the world. It was not true that he could not do any thing, but it was true that he could do something. The Lord commanded him to rise, and said, "Go into the city, and there it shall be told you what *you must do.*" When the Lord says a man *must do a thing*, it is not worth while for preachers to argue that he *can not*, ought not, or need not. Ananias was sent to Saul to tell him what he must do. He told him what he must do. He hesitated not, but did what he was commanded to do, and the Lord received him. He counted him a *wise man.* He heard the sayings of Jesus, and did them.

One more example will be sufficient for the purpose of this discourse. We learn, Acts xvi, that Paul and Silas came to Philippi to introduce the Gospel there, but, at first, received but little attention. A few obscure individuals gave some heed to the things that were spoken. A woman, possessed of an unclean spirit, followed after them for days, crying, "These be the servants of the most high God, who show to us the way of salvation." Paul never went to persons possessed of unclean spirits, spirit-rappers, spirit-mediums, or table-tippers, to get revelations. He had revelations of a higher order than they know any thing about, and, being grieved, he, in the name of Jesus Christ, commanded the unclean spirit to come out of her, and the spirit came out. Her masters, who were carrying her around and making a matter of gain from her magic arts, laid hold of Paul and Silas, and drew them into the market-place, before the rulers. And having brought them to the magistrates, they said, "These men, being Jews, greatly disturb our city; and teach customs which it is not lawful for us to receive." The magistrates rose up in the midst of the clam-

ors of the multitude, rent off their clothes, and commanded them to be beaten with rods. When they had laid many stripes on them, they cast them into prison, and charged the jailor to keep them safely. Receiving such a strict charge, he put them into the inner prison and fastened their feet in the stocks. At midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises to God. Suddenly there was a great earthquake, shaking the foundation of the prison, the doors were opened, and the manacles fell off the prisoners, and they were all loosed. The jailor, awaking from sleep, and seeing the prison doors open, drew his sword, and was about to kill himself. But Paul cried with a loud voice, and said, "Do yourself no harm, for we are all here." And calling for lights, he sprang in, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Here comes the same question: What must I *do?* It is not, How must I feel? What must I experience? nor, What must the Lord do? but, What must *I do to be saved?* They proceeded to speak to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house; in doing which, they told him what he must do. He rose and did what was commanded, and the Lord received him—likened him to a wise man. He was so anxious to do what the Lord commanded, that he did not wait till morning, but went the *same hour of the night.* This shows the importance then attached to doing the sayings of the Savior.

To these another class of Scriptures may be added, showing that this principle of *doing the will of God* runs through the entire Christian life; that it is not something confined to becoming a Christian, but will extend to the resurrection of the dead—to the eternal judgment. Matt. xxv: 34—The Lord says, he will say to those on his right hand, "Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." What does the

Lord give as the reason of this grand reception? "For," says he, "I was an hungered, and you gave me meat; I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you took me in; naked, and you clothed me; I was sick, and you visited me; I was in prison, and you came to me." What was the reason of all this? It was something *they had done*, and, because they had *done these good deeds*, the Lord will say, "Come, you blessed of my Father." They appear not to understand how they had done these good deeds, and he explains that, inasmuch as they had done these things to his servants, they had done them to him, or that, in doing those charitable deeds to his servants, *they had done them to him*, and he makes them the reason for the final reception in the great day.

Turn to John v: 28, and read the word of the Lord: "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." What is here laid down as the reason for coming forth to the resurrection of *life?* Having *done good.* They that have *done good,* to the resurrection of life. What is the reason here assigned for coming forth to the resurrection of *condemnation?* Having *done evil.* They that have *done evil* to the resurrection of condemnation. This is the great turning point—doing good and evil.

To whom is Jesus the author of eternal salvation? Heb. v: 9—Paul says: "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that *obey* him." To obey him is to *do his commandments.* The question turns on *doing* his sayings.

On whom will the Lord take vengeance, when he comes in judgment? 2 Thess. i: 7, 8—Paul says: "And to you, who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall

be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." What is the reason here assigned for taking vengeance? Knowing not God and *obeying not* the Gospel, or not *doing* the commandments or the sayings of Jesus.

Among the last words of God to man, he says: "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me to give to each one according as his works shall be."—Rev. xxii: 12.

Some man is ready now to file a bill of objections. "I see now," says he, "the whole tendency of your teaching You make man his own savior. He does every thing himself, and thus saves himself. This robs God of his glory, the Savior of all praise, the work of the Spirit and the grace of God of having any participation in man's salvation. The creature, by *his own acts, saves himself.* If he should get to heaven on this ground, in heaven he would forever shout praises to himself, that *he had done the work and saved himself.*"

If this objection could be made stronger, it should be done, for the object is not to annihilate a shadow, but to meet the objection in its full force and most formidable proportions. In order thus to a full elucidation of the subject, it must be explained that there are two parts in this great work of saving man—a *human* and a *divine* part, or a part that *man* performs and a part that God performs, and that neither part, alone, will save man. We must have the human and the divine parts together to accomplish the great work. These two parts are not only found in the kingdom of favor, but also in the kingdom of nature. They run through all of man's temporal pursuits in this life. Some illustrations may be found of the principle here involved in those pursuits. Suppose, for illustration, A and B are ready to commence farming in the spring. They have land pre-

cisely alike in quality and quantity. They walk out together and view the premises, and enter into a conversation touching the forthcoming operations. Mr. A proceeds to present his theory for the coming spring and summer. He says: "The Lord is infinite in goodness. He is also infinite in love. He loves me better than any earthly parent can love a child. He is also infinite in power. He has all power. He *can* cause a crop to grow without my feeble and imperfect works. His love and goodness are so great that he is willing to give me a fine crop without my working. As he has the *power* and is *willing*, I argue that he will give me a crop without work. I intend to stand off and let the Lord do the entire work, and then I will give him all the glory. I will not rob him of his glory by plowing, sowing, planting, and cultivating." Mr. B says: "I have no doubt about either the infinite power or goodness, but I have some doubt about its being *his will* to give me a crop without work, and not much doubt either, for I am very certain he will not give me a crop without work. I remember of reading in his good book, that I should eat my bread in the sweat of my face. I intend to work, plow, plant, sow, cultivate; to toil faithfully and honestly, believing the Lord will give me a crop. These two men proceed according to their programme, the one *working* and the other going about preaching on the attributes of God, and arguing with his neighbors against works. Thus they continue till about the 1st of November. A company, who have been listening at their arguments and noticing the different courses pursued by them, walk out to see what the Lord has done for these two men. They look over the farm where the man had been honestly and faithfully at work all the season, and find that the Lord has blessed him abundantly, crowned his labors richly—every thing abounding all around him. But what has the Lord done for the man who has been preaching and disputing with

his neighbors about the attributes of God all season and not working? He has carpeted his farm over with weeds, briars, and thistles, and you involuntarily say, "Served him right." What made the difference? When the Lord gave one, capacity to work, he did the same for the other. When he gave one, good rich land, he did the same for the other. When he sent the sun to shine on the one, he sent it to shine on the other. When he sent rain on the one, he sent it on the other. What, then, made the difference? The difference was, that *one worked* and the other *did not work*. Who had ground for giving God glory? The man that *worked*—that joined the human and divine part together. The Lord blessed him and not the other. In precisely the same way, it will turn out with those who *do* and those who *do not* the will of God. Those who *do not* will be likened to foolish men.

Suppose you were to visit a man that you knew twenty years ago, and who then had no property, but you find him with his broad acres of rich land, his storehouses filled, and abundance of every thing. You inquire of him, how he came by all this. He explains, that by his close application, industry, good management, and economy, he had secured it; but, on being seated at his table, before eating, he returns thanks to the Lord. You inquire of him: What do you mean, sir? Did you not tell me that you made all you possess by your close application, industry, good management, and economy? "I did," he replies. "Why, then, did you give thanks to God for it and not to *yourself*, seeing that by *your own works* it was acquired?" "I see," continues he, "that I shall have to explain the matter to you. There are two parts in this matter, a human part and a divine part. For the sake of making the distinction, I call what I do myself the human part, and the part the Lord does the divine part. When you were inquiring how I obtained my prop-

erty, I supposed, as a matter of course, you had reference to my own personal efforts in obtaining it; but when I gave thanks I was looking at the Lord's part, without which my own part would have amounted to nothing, and I gave thanks to the Lord, as if he had laid the loaves on my table. Or if you would have me elaborate the matter more fully, th Lord created me and capacitated me for business. He created the lands I own. He sends the rains, causes the sun to shine, gives the seasons, and causes every thing around me to grow and prosper. When I view all this stupendous part, and compare it with the small part which I do myself, my part sinks into such utter insignificance, that my heart rises in gratitude to God, as if I had done nothing myself. This is what I mean by the human and the divine part."

These two parts run all through the temporal as well as the religious departments. What would all our hard toiling, plowing, planting, sowing, and cultivating amount to, if the Lord did not send the rain, the sunshine, the season, and cause the growth? It would all avail nothing. So absolutely dependent are we on our heavenly Father. These two parts run through the entire system the Lord has ordained to save man. There is a human and divine part—a part for man to do himself, and a part which the Lord does for him. These two parts go hand in hand. Neither will go without the other. Now, please make out a list, and make it as large as possible, of what you have done yourself, and let us compare it with the divine part.

Do you say, "I have believed on the Savior of the world?" Well, it did not require much time nor labor to do that. In a land where the Gospel is preached, and a man hears it, it requires a greater effort to resist than to believe the Gospel. In the act of believing, a man renders no equivalent for any thing, but simply does that which was perfectly reasonable and consistent, easier to do than not to

do—to believe the divine testimony which God has given concerning his Son Jesus. A man certainly ought not to speak of it as a great labor he has performed to believe the truth of God. He would be very unreasonable not to believe, and certainly would not be saved. Still, it is no hard or difficult work to believe.

"But I have repented," says a man. That is certainly well, for he could not have been saved at all if he had not repented. "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." Still, there is not much work in repentance. Repentance can be performed in a short time. Thousands have repented in a single day. Repentance is like this: A man, going from one place to another, takes a wrong road. When he learns that he is wrong, inquires whether he cannot pass across, shorten the distance, and get into the right road. He is told that he can not; that the only chance there is of getting right is to turn back. When he gets back to the right road, he claims great credit for the work he has done in going back and correcting himself. It would be difficult to see that he has performed any great work, or that he should have any special credit, but is easy to see that he would have been a great simpleton if he had not gone back when convinced that he was wrong. No man can speak of repentance as a work of merit, a great work, or a work that can purchase salvation; yet man could not be saved without it.

Another man exclaims, "I have confessed the Savior." That is well; for he says, "Whoever confesses me before men, I will confess before my Father and before the angels." "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for with the heart man believeth to righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made to salvation." It is no great honor to the Savior to

have sinful mortals confess him, but a great honor to the sinner to sanctify his lips in confessing the Savior of men Still, that confession was no great work; it is made with one breath. It costs nothing, and requires but little time. There was no work in that. It ought not to be mentioned when speaking of work.

"But I have been immersed," exclaims another. There was not much work in that; it required very little time, and was attended with very little inconvenience. It was a mere circumstance, when speaking of work. There was nothing in it to merit any thing, or to be mentioned in the shape of work. Under ordinary circumstances, in an hour from the time of starting, a man is through with immersion. There can be no merit in this.

"But I have prayed, and prayed much," exclaims another. Indeed! and do you mention that as any great work you have done? You have asked for the things you needed, and obtained them. That is certainly getting things on very liberal terms. But much as you have asked, it is very probable that you have obtained more blessings that you never asked for, than you ever obtained even by asking! But it is most astonishing that the ingratitude of the human heart should ever become so great that we should mention our prayers as any great thing we have ever done. But prayer is no equivalent for any blessing. Many a poor beggar asks for the pittance he gets many times where you ask once for the rich gifts of heaven which you enjoy, and never refers to his much asking. Asking for blessings renders no equivalent, but we must be ungrateful beyond degree if we ask not for the blessings of heaven. "You receive not, because you ask not." It is certainly kind, merciful, and liberal in our heavenly Father to give when we ask, and certainly ungrateful in us to refuse to ask; but surely our asking returns no equivalent any more than the

asking of the beggar. When we are speaking of the work we have done, we ought not to mention our prayers; they merit nothing; they are no works.

"I have done a vast amount of going to meeting," says one. That is very well; but he should not mention that as any great work done; there was no other place he could have gone to and enjoyed so much; he could not have been so happy any where else. It is no great work for a man to go where he wants to be, and where he has the greatest happiness. It does not amount to much when a man goes to meeting if he has to be hunted up by the preacher, overseer, or deacon, persuaded, entreated, and exhorted to go to meeting when he does go. It might be as well for him not to go as to go; the heart is not in it, and his going is not free and voluntary; it is pretty much a matter of constraint. But the true disciple goes to the house of the Lord of **preference.** He longs to see the hour come, that he may go up to the house of the Lord and greet his brethren. "One thing have I desired of the Lord; and that is, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, and inquire in his temple." We speak not of going to meeting as a part of the good works we have done, but as an item of what we have done in seeking happiness in this world. We could have done nothing that would have rendered a greater amount of happiness in this life. It is no great work, then, any more than the attending of other places of enjoyment.

"But I have communed many times in my life." That was well; but you certainly do not mention that as any great work you have done. If you are truly a child of God, walking in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace; if you love our Lord Jesus Christ, you certainly do not look on it as **a work** to commemorate his death. You might esteem it a great privilege to sit at the Lord's table

and meditate on the death of the Savior—the great sin-offering of his own most precious blood, with which he entered heaven, the true holy place, to appear in the presence of God for us, and not a work, a mere duty, an obligation, but a most gracious privilege. It is the place where the children of God come into the most intimate union with their Lord and Redeemer. They meditate on his great love for us as displayed in his wonderful sufferings—the crown of thorns, the nails that pierced his hands, the spear that pierced his side, the blood that ran down, like water, on the ground. This should be the highest delight of a Christian; it is the nearest possible approach he can make to the Savior in this world. But it is nothing that should be mentioned as any great work we have done; and certainly no merit in it, but a great ingratitude if not done.

Another man exclaims, "I have paid a vast amount of money." That is all very well; but has he not paid as much for tobacco, to carry an election, or some other point in worldly ambition, or for the pride of life? If he has, which yielded the largest amount of happiness in this life? Certainly he will say what he expended for religion. But please inquire into this matter a little. What does a person want money for? The reply is, "To secure the necessaries of life and the greatest amount of happiness." Very well; has he ever expended the same amount in any other way that returned so large a revenue of happiness? Is he not happier to-day, in view of what he has expended in religion, than in view of the same amount expended in any other way? Would he have any of it back again? He certainly would not. If the Lord shall please to give him composure at death and right reason, do you think he would then have any of what he has contributed back? Would he have it expended in any other way? He certainly would not. The amount, then, he has given to the Lord has ren-

dered him already a larger revenue of happiness than the same amount expended in any other way, and will still render a larger amount of happiness at death than the same sum otherwise expended. We can not say much, then, even in view of the money contributed, of the works we have done. The human part even here has been very small. Sum up and put all a man has ever done, or can do, together, and make it look as large as possible, on the one hand, and then turn and see what the Lord has done on the other; or look at the divine part. Let us now survey the other side.

Of what does the divine part consist? What has the Lord done? The Lord has given us existence. This is a wonderful gift. The man who is not grateful for his existence must think meanly of himself. It is a wonderful thing to have an intelligent human existence; to be capacitated and endowed as man is. This one item, in the divine part, looms up so grandly that it overshadows all the human part.

But the Lord has not only given us existence, but given it in the grandest period of the world since creation's dawn. What period has there ever been in which existence was so desirable as at the present? Improvements and facilities for human happiness and usefulness abound all around us. A man, so to speak, can live more and do more, in a short life-time of fifty or sixty years, than he could in eight or nine hundred years before the flood. The means of securing the comforts of life, the beautiful countries, the stupendous improvements, the means of travel, transportation, of communication, etc., are inconceivable. The facilities for learning, knowledge, etc., in general, are immense. The means for Bible knowledge; the manuscripts, translations, histories of the Bible, of the church, of men, and of the world; the critical works, commentaries, concordances, lexicons, etc., are so abundant, that if a man does not learn

something, he must be stupid in the extreme. The fields the Lord now opens to men of enterprise, in all the great departments in life, are great and inviting beyond any thing in any other age of the world. We should bless God for existence in this grand period of the world.

But when we had sinned against Heaven, forfeited all, and were lost—without God, and without hope—the Lord had mercy on us, and opened up a way, new and living, whereby we could return to him and obtain pardon. In pity, in infinite compassion, he looked down on us and extended his Almighty hand to lift us up and give us glory and honor. "Know ye not," says Paul, "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; that though he was rich, for our sakes he became poor, that we, through his poverty, might be made rich." From riches, and glories, and honors he descended to the abodes of wretchedness, sorrow and woe, to lift us up and crown us with honor and glory. He condescended so low that he had not where to lay his head. When we come to this, all we have ever done sinks into insignificance and nothingness.

Then follow the Savior during his mission, and see him stooping to the poorest, and lowest, and humblest, in acts of mercy and compassion, kindness and benevolence. Behold his deep sympathy, his great love, his divine pity—none were too low, too humble, or too degraded for his divine compassion. Then look at the great and commanding displays of supernatural power, the mighty miracles, in attestation of his divine mission: the blind saw, the deaf heard, the dumb spoke, the lame walked, the dead rose, and the poor had the Gospel preached to them. "The works that I do, they testify of me," said he. The vast multitude, in the open blaze of daylight, are fed by miracle; the sea is calmed, and the furious winds subside at his mandate. When he dies, there is a great earthquake: the

rocks rend, and darkness spreads down over the whole land, from the sixth to the ninth hour. The vail in the temple is rent from the top to the bottom, as if to symbolize, that the way into the true holy place was about to be opened. Men in all directions are overwhelmed and filled with most profound awe. But even now, after the body is dead, they fear that something will come from it, and, with caution, place an armed guard of sixty men over it. A great stone is rolled to the entrance of the tomb, in which it is laid, and the governor's seal placed on it, with the charge, "Make it as secure as you can." His friends are disheartened. The enemies are exultant. They feel that they have gained a victory. But the question is not settled yet. He has only so far gone through the programme, precisely as he said he would before he died, and died the precise death he predicted. But he said he would rise again the third day. His enemies remember that he said this, but do not believe it. All they do is to guard against deception—against the body being stolen, and a report put in circulation that he has risen. The predicted time for his resurrection comes. The grand test is at hand—the decisive trial. Will he rise? Early on the morning of the third day, as the day began to dawn, an angel descended and rolled away the stone from the entrance of the tomb. The Lord rose from the dead, and, as if the Almighty determined a still fuller demonstration and attestation, a vast number of others—it may be, old saints, whose bodies rested about Jerusalem—rose, also, after his resurrection, and were seen of many in the holy city.

By the time you view these scenes, on the divine part, or in "the wonderful works of God," what think you of the human part—of all man does or can do? But the story is not near told. Follow on till the Lord ascends to heaven, is crowned Lord of all; till he sends the Holy Spirit to

guide the apostles into all truth, inspires the apostles, endues them with unerring power, sends them into all the world to preach the Gospel to every creature, gives them the Gospel, through them opens the door of the kingdom of God, receives men and cleanses them from all their pollutions in the blood of the Lamb; takes away the guilt, the condemnation, and justifies sinners—those who had forfeited every thing—and receives them as children, sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. He then extends to them line upon line, precept upon precept, saying to them, Come, my dear children, let me take you by the hand; I will never leave you nor forsake you, but will grant you grace and glory, and withhold from you no good thing. I am able to hold you up; to keep you from falling; I will be a strong tower round about you, realizing to you continually that the everlasting arm is underneath. In all your trials, afflictions, and fears, I will be a father to you, and you shall be my children. Call on me and I will hear you.

Such are a few of the consolations he furnishes as we pass along through this life. Then, when we come to the end of the race, to the conclusion of this life, and are called on to bid adieu to all that is dear on earth—father, mother, husband, wife, brother, sister, son, daughter; when the most tender fleshly ties are to be cut asunder and all earthly relations severed forever; when houses, lands, moneys, goods, chattels; in one word, when all kinds of worldly interests are to be surrendered; when the body itself is sinking, and the cold hand of death approaching; when the earthly powers are all failing, and even life itself is fading away, and the summons comes to cross the river, and the Lord reaches his hand and says, "Come, ye blessed of my Father enter into the joys of your Lord"—little will we think of all we have ever done. Thus, beyond the "rolling river," when he shall send a convoy of his blessed angels to escort

s to Abraham's bosom, to the paradise of God, to a state f rest, of comfort, till the resurrection morning, the immensity of the divine part, the work of the Almighty Father, or man, will begin to show up grandly.

But beyond this again, when the grandest day, since creation's dawn, shall come; when the world, as in the days before the flood, shall be rushing on its wild career, suspecting nothing, suddenly the ears of all nations will be saluted by the voice of the archangel and trumpet of God, announcing the grand summons, "Arise, you dead, and come to judgment." The graves will be opened, and all that are in their graves will come forth: they that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation. The saints will not simply be raised from the dead, or restored to what they were before they died, but changed, from mortality to immortality, from dishonor to a glorified body, like the glorified body of the Lord himself. God gives to every seed its own body, not as it was when sown, but the glorious body of the resurrection, a glorified, or immortalized body. When we think of this part of the work of our heavenly Father, all we ever did sinks out of sight. This prepares us for the interesting and glorious associations of the angels, the redeemed, happified, and glorified, in the heaven of heavens, in the presence of God and the Lamb.

But there is still another chapter in the work of the Almighty Father. His infinite hand fitted up the new heavens and new earth. When the old world, or the world before the flood, was filled with violence, polluted and corrupted so as to be beyond the reach of repentance, beyond the reach of all moral power, the Lord destroyed it by water. When the world that now is, shall culminate in crime, hardness of heart, and rebellion against God, the Lord will baptize it, not as he did in the days of Noah, *in water*, but in

fire. This prepares the way for the "new heavens and new earth," which the Lord shall fit up for the saints, in which righteousness shall dwell. When we are contemplating the divine part, then, we must take into the account this stupendous work of fitting up the new heavens and new earth. This all belongs to the divine part. Man has no agency or instrumentality in it.

There is, however, one more chapter in the divine part. The new Jerusalem, which John saw descend from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride for her husband, belongs to the divine part. "I saw," says John, (Rev. xxi: 2), "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride for her husband. And I heard a loud voice out of the throne, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and GOD-WITH-THEM shall be their God. And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor shall mourning, nor crying, nor pain be any more; because the former things are passed away." In view of this and what has preceded of the divine part, what shall we say of the human part? Certainly it will not hinder us from ascribing the blessing and the glory, and the honor of our salvation to God and the Lamb forever and ever.

What we do, or can do, is but little; but our most gracious Father can do much. We are weak, but he is strong. We are poor, but he is rich. We may, then, in the language of the Old Book, say, "Not to us, not to us, but to thy great name be all the honor and glory, O Lord of hosts." When we look to a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens; a rest remaining for the people of God; a city whose maker and builder is God, where all tears shall be wiped away, and there shall be no more sorrowing, nor any of the causes of sorrowing; where our hearts shall never

ache; where the weary are at rest and the wicked cease from troubling; where peace, joy, and love shall abide forever and ever; where we shall see Jesus, whom we have loved, praised, and adored, and dwell with him forever, in the presence of the Father, we shall say, It is enough.

In view, then, of the great things the Lord has done and proposes yet to do for the children of men, and the small amount he requires of man, what can be said to those who have never taken interest enough in these wonderful matters to take the first step, or do the first thing, of that small part required of man in order to his salvation? Can it be possible that men will live in a land of civilization, churches, preachers, and Bibles; in a Gospel land, and hear that Jesus died for them; that he rose from the dead, and will judge the world in righteousness, and utterly disregard his authority? Can they, will they hear and know, that he stands all the day long, stretching forth his hand to a disobedient people, and inviting them, by all his tender mercies, to come to him and live? Shall he appeal to them by all his love, his goodness, and compassion to come to him and live, and will they, in hardness of heart, impenitence, and unbelief, turn away and refuse to have his grace? While the Lord holds up before their eyes a history of the people before the flood, of the Egyptians and Sodomites, and warns them, by their terrible example, shall it fail to reclaim them? Shall the men of Nineveh, of Tyre, and Sidon, and the Queen of Sheba rise in the judgment and condemn the men of our time? Be warned by the fate of the people before the flood the Egyptians, those of Sodom and Gomorrah, Tyre and Sidon, the Jews and all the nations and peoples who have turned away their ears from the counsel of heaven, and turn to the Lord. Be warned by the terrors of the Lord, by the eternal judgment and the eternal condemnation of the wicked; be warned by the value of your precious soul and

the imperishable glories and honors to be awarded at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ. Be warned by all the nearest, dearest and most sacred interests of humanity; by all your relations in this life; the love you bear to fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, sons and daughters, as well as the community in which you live and which you owe your influence and means, in a liberal degree, to elevate, ennoble and save.

You will, to some extent, be held amenable in the last judgment, for the moral and religious condition in which you leave the community where you lived. If you never try to make yourself any better, not even so much as confessing the name of Jesus, or by any direct act, indorsing his religion, you will be held accountable for insubordination to the Lord and the life you have wasted in opposition to the will of God, that ought to have been spent in doing good. Think of these things and turn, while it is called To-day. Be entreated by all the tender mercies of our God, his goodness and compassion, to turn and live. To-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, but bow your will to the will of God.

SERMON, No. VI.

THEME—CONVERSION, OR TURNING TO GOD.

TEXT.—"Repent, therefore, and turn, that your sins may be blotted out, in order that the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord."—ACTS iii: 19.

THE introduction of the religion of Christ into the world, is the grandest event connected with the entire history of man. The founding of empires, kingdoms and republics, their revolutions and downfalls, hold no comparison in point of magnitude, with the one grand and transcendently sublime event of founding this new institution of religion, called the kingdom of Christ. The infidel that denies Christ and the divine authority of the Bible, still has this wonderful event, the most astounding one ever recorded—the founding of Christianity—to reason on and account for. There stands the undeniable fact, confirmed by the testimony of Jews, infidels, pagans and Christians; the united testimony of all history; uncontradicted by any authority, at the time, in the place, and by the persons, as reported in the Bible. Admitting all this, as a man of reason, and one who claims to account for the position he takes, it devolves on him to tell us how it was that a poor carpenter, a Nazarene, who had never received even common schooling, the society of influential persons, any power from wealth or birth, at the head of a dozen fishermen of Galilee, fresh from their humble avocation, uncouth, unaccomplished and unlettered, stood

up in Jerusalem, the center of the most violent religious bigotry, in opposition to the sanhedrim, the distinguished rabbis, scribes, and doctors of Jewish divinity, with their magnificent temple, imposing synagogues, altars, victims, and ancient ritual, on the one hand; and outside of all this, paganism, with the civil governments, the money and philosophy of the world at command, on the other; and in defiance of this combined opposition of the Jewish and pagan world, swept away their religious rites, forms, ceremonies and institutions, declaring them null and void, and established a new religion on the ruins!

How was this done, if God was not in the work? How did twelve unaccomplished, unlettered and moneyless fishermen, in defiance of the doctors, priests and scribes, in a few days after their leader had been put to an ignominious death, and they had shown themselves to be cowards, stand up boldly in Jerusalem and induce three thousand of the people to believe that God had raised this same leader from the dead and turn away from their former religion, associations, and every thing earthly that was dear to them, and commit themselves to this new faith? How did they persuade five thousand, on another occasion, to fall in with them? How did they, in a short time, extend the doctrine to Samaria, and in ten years to the Gentiles, bringing thousands on thousands to the faith? By what means, natural or supernatural, human or divine, did they, in forty years, extend it the length of the great Mediterranean Sea, to all the cities, towns and villages of note throughout Asia Minor, in the *mere strength of ignorant fishermen?* This they did, if the skeptic is right. How credulous the man must be who believes all this!

Paine, in his book, falsely styled "The Age of Reason," delighted to array Moses, Jesus, and Mahomet, in the same class, as three great impostors, and skeptics still delight to

speak of the similarity between the rise of Mohammedanism and Christianity; but certainly there was no similarity between the early progress of Christianity and Mohammedanism. Christianity proselyted three thousand persons the first day the death, resurrection and glorification of its founder in the heavens was fully unfolded, but Mohammedanism did not make one hundred converts in the first ten years. No impostor ever converted three thousand persons at the first speech, nor five thousand at the second; nor could the religion of Christ have done this, if nothing more than human power had been in it. Its success was not attained either by pandering to the pride of life, the lusts of the eye, the customs of the world, nor by enticing words of man's wisdom, or any effort to please man. The holy life, the pure morals, the austere manners it enjoined, forbid this. Nor was it done by sympathizing with other and false systems of religion in the world, nor the true one which the Lord had abolished; nor by aping the priesthood who taught these systems and bound them on the necks of the people. They remembered the command of their leader, "Be you not *like them.*" On the one hand, they openly declared the Jew's religion null, void, abolished, taken out of the way, and that by the deeds of its law no flesh could be justified. On the other hand, they declared all paganism an abomination in the sight of God; that pagan idols were not gods, but the workmanship of men's hands; that there was no salvation in them. They openly declared the whole world to be under sin, under the power of the wicked one—guilty before God; and that there was no other name given under heaven nor among men by which any person could be saved, but the name of Jesus. This was offensive to all, both Jew and Gentile alike, sweeping away every thing they held sacred under the name of religion. It was revolutionizing religiously, in all its bearings. He who can believe that twelve

fishermen, without learning or any superior natural ability, money, or popularity, in *their own mere human strength*, stood up in the face of the priests and scribes of Israel, on one hand, and the statesmen, philosophers, and men of wealth, combined with the entire pagan priesthood, on the other, as described; and advocated this new doctrine, defended, propagated and perpetuated it, as the facts in the case, admitted by Jews, pagans and skeptics show they did, never ought to speak of the credulity of mankind. The man who can believe all this is too credulous to be a Christian. He can believe without evidence. The Christian system only requires a man to believe with credible evidence.

Shortly after the great Pentecost, Peter and John went up to the temple at three o'clock in the afternoon, as we count time, it being the hour the Jews were accustomed to assemble for prayers. There were two causes moving them, if no more, in going there at this time. 1. The natural desire of the human soul, when in possession of good news, to tell it—to publish it abroad. They had the best news ever published—the news of a free and gracious pardon for a guilty and condemned race. 2. They had a divine commission from the great head of the Church, to "Go into all the world and preach these good news to every creature"—to "Go, and disciple all nations." Impelled, then, by the natural desire, burning in their breasts, to publish the good news of salvation to a perishing world, and a divine commission requiring them to do it, they went up to the temple. As they were passing the gate called Beautiful, their ears were greeted by the importunities of a beggar, a man lame from his birth, who was carried and laid there to implore the charities of the people as they passed into the temple. Looking on Peter and John, he asked them for money. These preachers were in a similar predicament with many others of whom we have heard; they were poor men and had no money, nor were

they ashamed to acknowledge the fact. Peter with John, looking intently on the man, as he lay before them, helpless, said, "Look on us." He anxiously gave heed to them, expecting to receive something. Peter said, "Silver and gold I have none; but what I have I give you: in the name of Jesus Christ, of Nazareth, rise up and walk. And he took him by the right hand and raised him up. And immediately his feet and ankle bones received strength; and leaping up, he stood, and walked, and entered with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God." This attracted the attention of the people, and thus served one of the principle designs of miracles. Miracles never converted anybody, nor was their design to convert. The design of this miracle was twofold: 1. To attract the attention of the people to get them to hear. 2. To prove to them that God was with these men, or, in other words, to confirm their divine mission.

Another matter worthy of note, in this grand transaction, is, that it occurred in broad daylight and openly, as if the Lord would challenge the world to investigate—to test the claims of the newly-authorized embassadors of Christ. Nor was this done in vain,for in the council held over the matter, by Annas the high priest, Caiaphas, John Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest, alluding to the healing of the lame man, they admitted, not only that a miracle had been done, but a noted miracle; and not only a noted miracle, but that it was known to all who dwelt in Jerusalem, and that they could not deny it.

Peter, seeing the eyes of the people earnestly fixed on himself and John, proceeded to guard against another evil against which no impostor ever does. "Why," says he, "look so intent on us, as if by our own power or holiness this man has been made whole?" This is in a very different spirit from that of Pope Pius IX, who claims to

be the successor of the apostle Peter. When they look intently on this modern Peter—the false Peter—the Man of Sin—or when they bow down before him, he never inquires, "Why look you so earnestly on us, as if by our own power or holiness this man had been made whole?" He claims that it is by *his own* power and *holiness* that wondrous things are done, and requires them to address him by "His Holiness," "Vicar of Christ," "Visible Head of the Church on Earth," "Lord God the Pope," etc. But the Peter whom Jesus sent, unlike this venerable head and representative of the great apostasy, when Cornelius, in his unenlightened condition, desired to worship him, forbade it, saying, "I myself also am a man." He would not permit any person to fall before him, as to the Lord. In the same style, in Solomon's porch, he inquired, "Why look you so earnestly on us, as if by our own power or holiness this man has been made whole?"

This was abundant caution that he might not fall into the sin of Moses, on account of which he was not permitted to lead the Israelites into the promised land. Some have supposed this sin was, that Moses became angry. Others think it consisted in his striking the rock. There is no evidence, however, that it consisted in either of these, but clear evidence that it consisted in an entirely different thing. He took the glory to himself and Aaron, that was due to God alone. Said he to the Israelites, "You rebels; must *we* bring you water from this rock?" The Lord says to him, "Because you sanctified *me* not in the eyes of this people, you shall not go before them into the land I have promised them." He did not set God apart before that people, or in their eyes, as the source of the water from the rock, but said, "Must *we* give you water from this rock?"

Peter avoids a similar sin, in inquiring, "Why look you so intently on us, as if by our own power or holiness this

man has been made whole? The name of Jesus Christ, through faith in his name, has given this man this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." How bold, manly, and self-denying this language, losing sight of himself, and carrying the minds of his hearers to his Lord and King. *The name* of Jesus Christ, through faith in *his name*, has made this man whole. This is done, too, in the presence of you all. As Paul said, before Agrippa, "This thing was not done in a corner," but openly and in broad daylight, before the gaze of a numerous multitude. This convinced them of the truth, and he proceeded as follows: "Repent, therefore, and turn, that your sins may be blotted out."

This opens the way for the main topic of this discourse, which is *conversion*. Many fears of unsoundness are entertained on this subject. On this account, it will be necessary to examine the subject with much care. The first thing, then, will be to consider the word *convert*, and examine its use, and ascertain its meaning in Scripture.

The original Greek word, *strepho*, occurs eighteen times in the New Testament, and is translated *turn*, in every instance, in the common version, except Matt. xviii: 3: "Except ye be converted and become as a little child," etc. The Bible Union translate it *turn*, here, and read it as follows: "If ye do not turn and become as little children," etc., thus making the turning *their own act*, and at the same time making them accountable beings. If man *can turn* from sin to the Lord, he is an accountable being and may justly be condemned for not turning. But if a man can not turn from sin to the Lord, he is not accountable, and can not be justly condemned for not turning. We do not condemn the wheel, which *can not turn itself*, for not turning, when there is no power on it sufficient to turn it.

In every instance where the word *strepho* occurs in the New Testament, except the last one, Rev. xi: 6, the person,

or that which was turned, *turned itself*, as for example, Acts vii: 42, "God *turned*;" Acts xiii: 4, Paul says, "We turn to the Gentiles;" Luke vii: 9, Jesus "turned him about;" Luke vii: 44, "He turned to the woman."

The original Greek word, *epistrepho*, occurs thirty times, and is translated, in the common version, turn, or its equivalent, twenty-two times. It is eight times rendered *converted*, or *convert*. In a large majority of these cases, that which was turned, *turned itself*, as Matt. ix: 22, "Jesus turned him about;" Matt. x: 13, "Let your peace return to you;" Mark v: 30, "Turned him about in the press," etc. There is nothing in the meaning of this word, showing which way the *turning*, or converson is, whether from bad or good. This must be learned from the connection, as for example, 2 Pet. ii: 22, "The dog turned to his vomit again;" Mark xiii: 16, "Let him not turn back," etc. In one instance, where the turning is to the Lord, the turning is ascribed to the preacher; as, for example, Acts xxvi: 18, Paul was to "turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." The turning is here ascribed to the preacher, in view of his agency, or instrumentality, in turning them. The turning is never ascribed to God, to Christ, or to the Holy Spirit. Still, it is true, when we are looking to God as the author of the entire scheme, by which we are turned and saved, we say that *God turns us*. When we are looking at the instrumentality of the preacher, we ascribe the turning to him. When we are looking at the act of turning, we ascribe the turning to man.

Converted to God, means *turned to God*, and nothing else. It is the purpose of this discourse to elucidate this whole matter fully. In order to this, it is necessary to make a few preliminary statements:

No person turns to God properly, or in the sense of the Gospel, without undergoing three distinct divine changes.

1. A distinct divine change in the heart. 2. A distinct divine change in the life, or character. 3. A distinct divine change in the state or relation. When a man is divinely changed in heart, life and relation, he is a new creature, a child of God.

In order to these three distinct divine changes, there are three distinct appointments in the Gospel. 1. The Lord has appointed faith to change the heart. 2. He has appointed repentance to change the life. 3. He has appointed immersion to change the relation. The heart is never changed by repentance. The character is never changed by immersion. The state is never changed by faith. Faith and repentance together, never changed the state or relation. Immersion never changed the heart, or life.

These three grand items, in turning to God, can not be reversed in their order. The state or relation can not be changed first, then the life, and then the heart. The life can not be changed first and then the heart. The heart is the beginning place. The change in the heart must be produced first. There can be no repentance, or change in the life, produced by repentance, till the heart is changed. The change in the heart leads to repentance, and produces it. Repentance results in a change of life, or it is worthless. The order of heaven is, that faith must come first, producing a change in the heart. Repentance must follow next, producing, as its legitimate fruit, a change of life. When the heart and life are both changed, the person is ready for a new state or relation.

The way is now clear for the investigation of this work, as a whole, and each of these items separately, in particular.

I. What, then, is meant by *a distinct divine change in the heart?* Such a change as destroys the love of sin and establishes the love of God in the heart of the sinner. The love of sin must be completely destroyed in the heart, so

that the subject hates it and no longer desires to practice it; and the love of God, of righteousness, and holiness, established in the heart, so as to create hunger and thirst after righteousness. In nine-tenths of the cases where preachers talk of "experimental religion," and require persons to tell experiences, the amount of the experience is no more than that the subject has experienced a change—that what the subject once loved he now hates, and what he once hated he now loves. This is all right as far as it goes, but, in many churches, it is taken for more than there is in it. It is taken not only for what it is—a change in the heart—but for the entire process of turning to God; a work of grace, evidence of pardon, the impartation of the Holy Spirit—a new creature. This is too much. All this is not in it. Where the statement is true, there is this much in it, a change in the heart—no more. The love of sin is destroyed in the heart and the love of God established there. That is all. There is no repentance, no change of relation, no pardon, no impartation of the Holy Spirit. The person is simply prepared in heart for all the balance of the work which should follow. Those who thus limit conversion do not comprehend the work. They stop with a single item.

II. What produces this distinct divine change in the heart? It has already been stated that faith produces it. This must now be elaborated and elucidated. Perhaps a description of a case and the manner in which the change in the heart was effected, will, at least, illustrate the subject. Suppose, then, there is a man in your community forty-five years old. In his business operations, he has prospered greatly. Success attends all his plans and financial operations. He is a true gentleman in the worldly sense. He attends fairs, takes the premiums; has fine stock, bets on them when he can find a gentleman who will bet five hundred or a thousand dollars. When he drinks, he goes to an elegan'

saloon, where they have imported wines and brandies, and only drinks enough to make him feel a little richer and sharper in trading than he would otherwise be. Never swears, only when angry and "can't help it." He attends the races; goes to the theater; never gambles, except where the first class, in some place of refinement and elegance, engage in games for large sums. He rides in an elegant carriage drawn by superb horses. He assists to build churches, especially if he thinks it will enhance the value of his property two or three times as much as he gives; gives a little to the poor, but don't see any use in being poor. He never goes to meeting, except on some extraordinary occasion; but has no use for preachers, Bibles, and churches. They may be of some service to moralize and keep down ignorant and vicious people. Thus a rich and successful operator goes through the world, and to the eternal judgment, making money, seeking pleasure, and thoughtless about his soul and his relation to God.

In the midst of this mad career, the Lord puts his hand on a little son of seven years, and after some fifteen days of terrible suffering, the precious and innocent child breathes the last breath, struggles the last time, and closes its eyes in death. He stood over and ministered to the little sufferer till the last struggle was over, and saw it sink away in death. Many times already he had planned for the education of that child in some fine university and thought of the property he would give him, but alas! he is gone. His breast swells, he heaves a deep sigh, and groans inexpressibly. Secretly, he inquires, "What is the meaning of all this?" Down he sinks with his heart broken. The world appears now to be one vast gloom. A new theme has come up for his consideration, and one that can not be put off. Arrangements for the funeral, the coffin, cemetery, and grave are

the matters that now rush up before him. In awful solemnity and inexpressible grief they are considered. But now what is to be done? A preacher must be had and a funeral sermon must be preached, but what preacher shall be had? He knows nothing of the merits of preachers or churches; but he had a grandfather or a grandmother that belonged to some popular Church, and if he leans at all, it is toward that Church and preacher. He remembers how said preacher entered the "sacred desk" with a black robe on, in a very solemn manner, with other evidences of wisdom, piety, and orthodoxy. It is decided that he is the man to preach the funeral sermon. He is sent for, comes, and preaches the sermon.

The heart of the afflicted man has become tender, and is susceptible of good impressions. He is willing to hear something about the soul and the other world. He is satisfied that his little child has gone to rest. In the sermon the preacher repeats the words: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What an awful question! He meditates on it, and, in inexpressible grief, looks back at his effort to gain the world, or as large a share of it as possible. He looks at the other part of it, *losing his own soul!* Is it possible that a man may lose his own soul?

The funeral is over. He and his wife return to their fine mansion. But pride is stricken down. Their hearts are broken. All is gloom. The sweet voice of a dear little son is heard no more. His quick step is no more heard. His little toys are found and laid carefully away as mementoes. He inquires, "Wife, where is that scripture quoted by the preacher?" He can not repeat it, but gives her some idea of it. She knows not where it is, but after a long search, they find and read it many times over: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his

own soul?" They sit and weep over it. "Shall we," said he, "in our stretch to gain this world, *lose our own souls?*" This theme engages their attention much of the time till the next Lord's day. By this time they are both anxious to attend meeting. In the discourse, the preacher repeats the words: "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." In his mind he repeats the words, "the wages of sin is death." "Is it possible," says he, "that this is the wages for which I have been working all my life?" He ponders this in his mind during the week, and commences reading his Bible and talking of what he reads, in his family. He longs for the next Lord's day, that he may hear preaching again. You can see now that he is changing rapidly. He attends meeting again, and the preacher quotes the words: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." This strikes down deep into his heart. "And," he exclaims, "is this the end to which I am coming?" Thus he continues on, week after week, struggling under the power of faith. He now is reading and talking about religion much of his time, and inviting religious people home with him. He begins to approach the preacher, and invites him to visit him, and to find his chief delight in religious conversation.

About this time, one of his former associates informs him of some great races soon to come off, and invites him to accompany them. He replies kindly but very decidedly, "I shall not be there." Another invites him to attend a great ball, soon to come off. He replies, with decision, "I shall not be there." All such follies and vanities have lost their attraction to him. The change that he has undergone is so great, that the amusements and pleasures, as he once called them, not only have no attraction for him, but would make him unhappy if he were where they are. He has no

taste or relish for them. The love for them is utterly destroyed in his heart. The matters of the kingdom of God are opening up to him. His soul is now seeking rest, peace and joy in the things of God. His moral sensibilities are all alive and shocked at the thought of vanities and follies such as here alluded to. Truly can he now say, "The things I once loved I now hate, and the things I once hated I now love." This is what is meant in this discourse by "a change of heart"—such a change as *destroys the love of sin* in the heart and *plants the love of God in its place.* This would be received as a divine change of heart in any church in the land. The affections are changed from the love of the world to the love of God. As the popular style of expressing it is, "his feelings are changed."

One grand mistake, very current at the present time, is to regard this change in the heart and, as they say, "in the feelings," as *an evidence of pardon!* It is no evidence of pardon, nor of acceptance with God. Pardon is not a change *in us,* but an act of the pardoning power in heaven *for us.* We do not feel pardon *in us,* as it is not *in us,* but done in heaven for us. In time of the war, a man was condemned to be shot, and the day set for the execution. His friends sent a petition to the President to pardon him. No reply came, and the general expectation was that he would be executed. His wife took cars and went in person, to make her plea for pardon. She obtained admittance to the President's apartment, and as she entered his room, she shrieked out, "O, my husband!" The President took her by the arm, raised her up, and inquired, "Madam, what of your husband?" She exclaimed, "My husband is condemned to be shot, and I have come to seek and obtain pardon for him." The President wiped away his tears and invited her to be seated, adding, "Your husband shall be

pardoned." She instantly sprang to her feet, thanked him from the depths of her heart, and praised God. But her husband did not rejoice yet, because this work was not going on *in him*, but *in Washington for him*. The pardon was written out and handed to his wife. She hasted to the telegraph office and dispatched to a friend near the prison of her husband, in the words, "I have obtained a pardon for my husband." Still the husband *felt no pardon*, and did not rejoice. The dispatch was soon read to him, and he then wept tears of inexpressible joy, though yet bound in prison, and praised God for the pardon that had been obtained.

The change in the heart of the sinner, as described in this discourse, is not pardon, nor an evidence of pardon, but a change in his heart, preparing him in heart for pardon. This change, then, is here taken for just what it is, no more, no less. The heart is turned to the Lord. He is now right in heart. This is the first distinct divine change.

III. The next distinct divine change, is *a divine change in the life*. All the change a man can have in his heart amounts to nothing, unless there is a corresponding change in his life. The Lord's appointment to produce this, *is repentance*. Repentance is a change in the mind or purpose. When this repentance is what it ought to be, and what *must be*, to be acceptable to the Lord, it is a change of mind or purpose sufficient to result in a change of life, or in a reformation of life. Repentance does not change the past life. This is beyond the reach of the sinner. Nothing short of the hand of God can change the past life. Pardon separates the sinner from the past life, all its guilt, and the consequences that would follow in the world to come without pardon. The penitent regrets the past life, sorrows for the sins with which it is filled up, and grieves over them, but this in no way changes his relation to the past life. Nothing but an act of mercy from the Sovereign, in graciously granting par-

don, can change the sinner's relation to his past sins. This is not repentance. Repentance looks to the future life. When it is genuine, such as it must be in order to be acceptable to God, it is a change of mind or purpose so great as to result in a change in life for the time to come. It looks forward and promises to cover the whole future life, while pardon looks back and covers the whole of the past life, saving him from the past as repentance does from the future. This repentance prepares the sinner in life or in character for pardon, but is not pardon itself. When the sinner is changed in heart, so that the love of sin is destroyed in his soul and the love of God established in him, and so changed in his mind as to destroy the practice of sin, as to induce him to cease to do evil and learn to do well—to desire from his heart to do the will of God—to hunger and thirst after righteousness—he is a proper subject for pardon.

IV. Though the sinner is now changed in his heart and life, the love and practice of sin both destroyed in him, there is yet no change in his relation. He is still in the same state. *He* is greatly changed, but the *relation* is not changed. The change, so far, is only *in him*, not *in the relation*, at all. Being now changed in heart and life, and thus fitted for the new relation, he is now a proper subject for a new state or relation. What is it, then, that transfers the person into the new state or relation; the person whose heart has been changed by faith, and whose life has been changed by repentance? Immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is the divine appointment to change the state or relation. Immersion does not change the heart nor the life, but the state or relation of the person whose heart and life have been changed by faith and repentance. This accounts for one trouble that many people find. They find many good people who have never been immersed, and many bad people who have been immersed.

This is a plain matter. Immersion does not make them good. It changes neither their hearts nor lives. If persons are immersed who have not the faith to change them in heart, or the repentance to change them in life, as, no doubt, is the case with many, they will be no better than they were before. But that does not prove that the person who is changed in heart by faith, and changed in life by repentance, is in the new state till immersed into Christ, or that he need not be immersed into Christ. He is the very person that ought to be immersed into Christ.

Some one may inquire, What do you mean by a change of state or relation? The *very act itself* of entering into the kingdom or Church, is what is meant. It is not the change in the heart that prepares a man in heart to enter, nor the change in life, that prepares a man in life to enter, that is here meant by a change in relation, but the *act*, on the part of one already changed in heart and life, of *entering into the kingdom*. Faith changes no relation, but changes or prepares a man in heart for a change of relation. Repentance changes no relation, but prepares a man in life for a change in relation. Immersion changes no man's heart or life, but changes the state or relation of the believing penitent, transferring him into the new state or relation.

But it is very desirable to have a distinct idea of what is meant by this new state. A change of state, is simply to change from one state to another. The change alluded to, in the state or relation is expressed in several clear passages of Scripture, as the following: "Immersed into one body"—"immersed into Christ"—"enter into the kingdom"—"immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Each of these expressions has the idea of transition from one state to another. The transition is into a state of justification. Every man immersed into one body is in a justified state. "Immersed

into Christ" amounts to the same thing. To "enter into the kingdom of God," amounts to the same, for all who enter into the kingdom of God are justified, and none who do not enter into the kingdom of God are justified. All believing penitents, immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, are in the kingdom, in one body, in Christ, in a state of justification. When the Lord says, "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved," it is equivalent to he who believes and is immersed shall be pardoned or justified. When he says, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," the amount of it is the same as if he had said, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the body of Christ or be pardoned. A man can be changed in heart, be good in heart, and not be in the kingdom of God. He can be good in life and not be in the kingdom of God; but no matter how good he is in heart and life, he is not in the kingdom or body of Christ unless immersed into the body. Immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, on the part of a believing penitent, is the visible act, in which he is transferred from one kingdom to another. Before this act, though he may be prepared in heart and life to enter, he is out of the body or kingdom; after this act, he is in the body or kingdom.

No two persons can properly enter the marriage relation without three similar changes. 1. A change in heart. 2. A change in the life. 3. A change in the relation or state. In the acquaintance the parties form, the faith or confidence in each other becomes such as to change their hearts or affections. Here there is a change in their feelings, and the desire to enter the marriage relation is established. This is followed by a visible change in their lives. A series of preparations for an anticipated new relation comme

They are still single, notwithstanding the change in heart and life. The time is appointed and the marriage ceremony is performed. Before that ceremony they were each in a single state. Now they are married, the state is changed. When did they enter the marriage covenant? When did they enter the new state? When their hearts and feelings were changed? Certainly not. When their lives were changed and a change was seen in their actions? By no means. But when the marriage ceremony was pronounced. This is the time when they entered the new relation. The whole relationship throughout the entire train of connections, on both sides, was changed the moment that ceremony was pronounced. It did not change their hearts or lives, make them any better, or love any more ardently, but it changed the relation. The marriage is not dated from the time of the first change they experienced in their hearts, nor from the time of the first change in their lives, but from the time when the marriage ceremony was performed. If the gentleman is worth a million of money, and falls dead one minute before the ceremony would have been performed, the lady is not legally entitled to one dollar interest in his estate. If he falls dead one minute after the ceremony is pronounced, she has an interest in it. There is something in an "external performance," an "outward act." The changes in the heart and life were necessary, and they were not prepared to enter the new relation without those changes, but the act of entering was a separate thing. So the changes in the heart and life of the sinner are necessary, and he would not be prepared to enter into the kingdom of God without these changes, or to enjoy the kingdom when in it, but they only prepare him to enter, and do not transfer him into the kingdom. And in like manner, immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, of a penitent believer, has no tendency to change the heart, and

is not designed for that purpose, but is solely to change the relation. In it the proper subject is transferred "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," "into Christ," "into one body," "into the kingdom," into a state of justification or pardon.

The person, then, being turned to the Lord in heart by faith, in life by repentance, and in his relation by immersion, is, in heart, and life, and relation a new creature.

It is of great advantage, in looking at all subjects, to keep the items all distinct. Men sometimes say, the Lord gives faith. This is true in a certain sense, but not the sense generally intended. In creating man, he gave him intelligence, or the ability to believe facts on credible testimony. He gave us the Gospel; sent men to preach it to us, that we might hear and believe it. When men ask whether they can believe *in* and *of themselves*, if they mean without the facts given to believe, or the Gospel that brings them to us, they should be answered that *they can not*. But if they mean to inquire, whether a man can believe the Gospel when preached to him, without some supernatural power *performed directly on him*, to enable him to believe, or *on the Gospel*, to make it believable, they should be answered, *he can*. If he can not, he can not be justly condemned for not believing. The part, then, the Lord performs in making a believer, is in giving a man the Gospel, which *he can believe*. He will, therefore, condemn him for not believing.

The part that believing performs, in preparing a man for the enjoyment of God, is in changing his heart, thus destroying the love of sin and establishing the love of God in him.

The part that repentance performs, is in changing his life; destroying the practice of sin for the future.

The part that immersion performs, is in changing the state or relation of the man previously prepared in heart by

faith, and in life by repentance, for the kingdom of God. He is immersed into the name, the body or kingdom.

Pardon is not done in the sinner, in the water, nor on earth, but *in heaven*, for the sinner, separating him forever from all past sins, and receiving him as innocent, as if he had never sinned.

The impartation of the Holy Spirit, is the consummation in turning to God. Because you are sons, he has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, saying, Father, Father.

Now, is Peter the same in Solomon's porch as Peter on Pentecost? Where did he begin on Pentecost? He began by preaching the Gospel. He did the same in Solomon's porch. On Pentecost, when they heard the Gospel preached, they were cut to the heart. They would not have been cut to the heart if they had not believed. When he made his appeal in Solomon's porch, upon the healing of the cripple, they heard and believed. On Pentecost, he commanded them to repent. He did the same in Solomon's porch. On Pentecost he commanded them to be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Instead of this, he commanded them, in Solomon's porch, to "be converted," as it reads in the common version, or "turn," as it reads in both the New Translation, by Anderson, and the Revised Version, by the Bible Union, "that your sins may be blotted out." There will be no difficulty in seeing that "the remission of sins," and "sins blotted out," amount to the same. But some will be troubled to see how "be immersed" and "be converted," or "turn," amount to the same. Yet this is the case. "Be immersed," is a literal command. There is nothing figurative about it. But the command, in Solomon's porch, to "turn," puts the result accomplished in immersion for immersion itself. These persons were already turned in

heart by faith, and they are, in the connection, commanded to repent, which turns or changes the life. There was nothing remaining to turn or change but the relation. This was the turning commanded, and as this is effected in immersion, the command here amounted to the same as the command to be immersed on Pentecost. That on Pentecost was "in order to the remission of sins;" and that in Solomon's porch, "that your sins may be blotted out." On Pentecost he says, "and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit;" and in Solomon's Porch, he has "the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord;" the same, expressed in different words.

A man says, "That is all clear enough, but I am afraid I have not the right kind of change of heart." The following case will illustrate a proper change in the heart, and the Lord's mercy and love in receiving the penitent sinner when he turns to Him: A young man ran off from his father and mother, and was absent a year before they knew where he had gone. Many prayers had fervently gone up to heaven for him, many tears had been shed over him, and many long and solemn conversations had been held, by an anxious father and mother, about him. After about a year, a friend found him in California, and, knowing the anxiety about him, immediately wrote his father a letter, informing him where he could write to him. The father received the letter, and lost no time in writing his son. The young man took the letter from the office and said, when he saw his father's handwriting, it moved him to his heart. But he determined to read it, as he expressed it, "like a man," and not shed any tears over it, as he thought "weak people" do. He decided, however, not to read it till he was alone. As he was returning, he stopped in a path in the dense forest, and opened the letter, nerving himself against weeping. He thought he was succeeding finely as he read

down through the main body of the letter, as he restrained all his tears. At the bottom he saw a postscript, in something like the following words: "My dear son, it is late at night, and your dear mother is sitting by my side, bathed in tears, weeping over you." His manliness, as he falsely styled it, gave way, and he sank down by the path and wept like a child. Immediately he rose up, and resolved, "I will go home to my father and mother." This illustrates the right change of heart when the sinner resolves to turn and go home.

The balance of the history of the case, illustrates the mercy and goodness of God in receiving the sinner when he turns. As early as possible, he started homeward, and reached his father's house one morning at eight o'clock, and rapped at the door. The father, not knowing that his son was within three thousand miles of home, opened the door, and saw his son. The young man stretched forth his hand and exclaimed, "O, father, can you forgive me?" The father's heart melted; he sprang forth and embraced him, replying, "With all my heart, I forgive you, my dear child." In a moment he was brought into the house, and, looking into another apartment, he saw the mother, who wept while that letter was being written, approaching, when he cried out, "O, mother, can you forgive me?" You know how a good mother can forgive! Young man, your mother stands next to God. If you do so badly that your mother can not forgive you, there is but one more you can go to. Your mother will forgive when no other human being will forgive. The mother, in an ecstasy, sprang forward and clasped her boy in her arms, exclaiming, "With all my heart, my dear child, I forgive you." "So there is joy in heaven among the angels of God when one sinner repents," says Jesus. How kind and compassionate is our heavenly Father, against whom we have sinned, not only

one year, but every year of our life, till we turned to the Lord, to forgive all our sins—blot them from the book of remembrance and remember them no more forever—not even permit them to be mentioned; and how wonderfully ungrateful must man be to refuse to come and accept this most gracious pardon, when freely and mercifully offered! And when we remember that he stands all the day long, stretching forth his hands to a gainsaying and disobedient people, the ingratitude is heightened if men and women refuse. By all his tender mercies, then; his goodness, his great love; his wonderful compassion; by the value of your precious souls; by the sufferings of the bleeding, dying Savior; the shame and indignation heaped on him, when he bore our sins on the cross; by all that is lovely and endearing, be persuaded to turn to the Lord and live forever.

SERMON, No. VII.

THEME.—THE ADAPTATION OF THE BIBLE TO MAN.

TEXT—"All scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work." —2 TIM. iii: 16.

THE leading theme of this discourse, is, *the adaptation of the Bible to man.* If it could be shown that the Bible is not adapted to man—that the author of it did not comprehend man's nature, the exigencies of his being, the demands of his existence, and had not met them in the Bible, it would be a stronger argument against its claims to be divine than any one ever offered, and, no doubt, a better one than will ever be offered. On the other hand, if it can be shown that the Bible is adapted to man—that the author of it knew what was in man, fully comprehended his nature, all his wants, the demands of his existence, and completely provided for them in the Bible, it furnishes a conclusive argument in favor of its divine authority. In this discourse, the ground is taken that the Bible, *as it is,* is adapted to man *as he is.* To explain what is meant by this, a fuller statement is demanded. The Bible, *as it is,* means the Bible as every man has it, without any miracle performed on it since it was given to the world to give it life or power, to make it intelligible or credible—simply the

Bible, printed in every man's own language. Man, *as he is*, means man as he now exists, without any miracle performed on him, any new faculties given him, any supernatural quickening, awakening, or enlightening, to enable him to believe the Bible. It is here claimed that no immediate power from God is demanded to give the Bible life, power, or credibility; nor to give man intelligence, new faculties, or ability; but that man, *as he is*, when he has the Bible in his own language, can believe it, *as it is*, to the saving of his own soul. Hence you never read of any holy man, in apostolic times, praying to the Lord to give his word power, to accompany it with an immediate energy; to infuse life into it, quicken it, or make it intelligible. Nor do you ever read of any holy man of that day praying to the Lord for the impartation of immediate power, intelligence, new faculties, or ability to enable the sinner to understand the word of God and believe it.

There are some leading and important questions that come into the minds of all thinking persons. Some of these are put to parents, school teachers, and Sunday-school teachers, by the children; such, for instance, as the following: 1. Why did the Lord create us? 2. What did the Lord come into the world for? 3. What did the Lord give us the Bible for? These are important questions, and should be carefully answered, as they lie at the foundation of correct religious knowledge.

1. Why did the Lord create us? In their early studies, some of our readers may have met with a little work, called the "Shorter Catechism." As now recollected, the first question in it is, "What is the chief end of man?" This is an important question. What is the chief end, object, or purpose of man's existence? What is or was the chief purpose or object of the Lord in creating man? The answer given in the Catechism is "To glorify God and enjoy him

forever." This is a correct answer and an intelligible one. The chief purpose of God in creating man was that he might glorify God and enjoy him forever. No matter if you can not reconcile this with another part of the Catechism: it is true, nevertheless. Man was created for a high and noble purpose, and when he does not attain to it, he fails by his own perversity.

No doubt some are saying they prefer Scripture—that the Catechism is not synonymous with Scripture, in their estimation. To the Scriptures, then, turn: "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet."—Ps. viii: 5, 6. What does the sweet singer of Israel say the Lord made man for? He made him to have dominion, and put him over the works of his hands. He created man for no ignoble purpose—no low and servile end; but intended him to have an exalted position—to have glory and honor—to be placed over the works of the hands of God. All men know that wonderful something exists in them—no matter what you call it—that never was fully satisfied with what they are and what they have. There is continually in them that craving, aspiring and unsatisfied something, reaching forward, looking ahead, anticipating, hoping for and desiring happiness never yet attained. Why is this? Is it not that man was created for something better than he has ever reached—that, by some means, he has fallen short and needs lifting up? The All-wise Creator has certainly not created a desire for happiness, or for glory and honor, and made no provision for it. God made man for dominion, for glory and honor, and has provided dominion, and glory, and honor for him. If man does not attain to it, the reason is in his own perversity in thwarting the benevolent purpose of God, and thus

disqualifying him for the enjoyment of the blessings provided for him.

It may be that some man will say that a finite creature, in a finite state, has no ability to thwart the benevolent purpose of God and deprive himself of happiness which the Lord provided for him. Are you sure of that? Can not a man destroy his health by excessive eating, drinking, and other dissipations, so that he can not enjoy food, drink, and sleep? Many have experienced this to their sorrow. Can not men destroy and corrupt themselves to such an extent that they can not enjoy good society, even if admitted into it? Certainly they can. If men will not read of God, thus keeping the company of the prophets, the apostles, evangelists and saints of Bible times; will not associate with the pure and the holy, the good and the true, of our own time, but associate with the low, the corrupt, the enemies of the Bible, will they not so pervert their nature, destroy themselves, and become so averse to God and all that is godlike, that they could not enjoy God, Christ, angels, or saints, if they were in heaven? Men, by their perversity and dissipation, have destroyed their hearing, their sight, their appetite, and even their reason, and thus rendered themselves incapable of enjoying the blessings which God has graciously and freely provided for them in the world. They may, and many are, doing the same in reference to the world to come.

In Paul's address, that he delivered on Mars' Hill, in Athens, in the presence of the most distinguished judges and philosophers, is found a fine statement touching the purpose of God in creating man. He says, "He has made of one blood every nation of men, that they might dwell on all the face of the earth, having marked out their appointed times, and the bounds of their dwelling; that they might seek for God, if perhaps they would feel after him, and find

him, although, indeed, he is not far from every one of us." —Acts xvii: 26, 27. The Lord anticipated the fall when he created man, and made him that *he might seek the Lord and find him.* This is true of the whole race. All were created that they might seek God and find him—that they might have dominion—that they might glorify God and enjoy him forever.

What did the Lord come into this world for? "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved." He did not send his Son to irresistibly save any body, but that the world through him *might be saved.* He reprobated none by any original decree, or decree before the world was, so that *they can not be saved!* We repeat, the Lord "came into the world, that the world, through him, might be saved." This was the object or purpose of his coming. He thus gave the world the privilege of being saved. It was his most gracious and benevolent design in coming into this world, and perfectly accords with his design in creating man.

What did God give the Scriptures for? "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable." Profitable for what? If one were to notice the popular custom of the preachers, he might infer that the Scriptures were given that they might have a convenient book from which to get texts, for this is one use made of them. But Paul does not say the Scriptures are profitable for that use. If one were to look again, he might suppose that the Lord designed the Scripture as proof of the doctrines and commandments of men, for a man in one church is busily engaged in quoting Scripture to prove Universalism, in another Unitarianism, in another Trinitarianism, in another Calvinism, in another Armenianism. If this was the purpose of God in giving us the Scriptures, it is certain that the

apostles and first Christians never so understood it. They never used them for any such purpose. What, then, does Paul say they are profitable for? They are profitable for *doctrine* or for *teaching*. Is it not astonishing that men should be hesitating about what doctrine to adopt, and debating about what the true doctrine is, when the apostle so clearly states, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine or teaching." He does not say it is profitable to prove *our doctrine by*, but *it is the doctrine itself*. There certainly need be no further confusion about which the true doctrine is. If God gave the Scriptures for doctrine, take them and stand by them as the doctrine or teaching of the Lord. You will have the true doctrine, the doctrine admitted to be true by all, and the only true doctrine. This is the doctrine for the people of God—the disciples of Jesus. They do not desire to be annoyed by being called on to prove their doctrine every week or month, and they therefore take the Scriptures given by inspiration of God, divinely declared to be profitable for doctrine or teaching, and proved true in the time of the apostles and not denied by any but open skeptics. These Scriptures are profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work. What more can any man want?

The Lord created man that he might glorify and enjoy God forever; that he might have dominion, glory, and honor; that he might seek the Lord and find him. Jesus came into the world that the world, through him, might be saved; and the Scriptures are profitable for doctrine, to perfect the man of God, and thus thoroughly furnish him for every good work. This all agrees with the one great and benevolent design of the Lord to open the way for the happiness of man. How grateful he should be for those benevolent provisions!

The Scriptures, given for and adapted to man, have supreme ascendancy over all human systems—all creeds, confessions, and disciplines ever made by uninspired men. This lofty and sublime claim of the Scriptures can not be treated here except in a single particular, to wit, *their broad and extended benevolence*, when compared with all the creeds of men. Suppose, for illustration, a man should approach you with one of the best of all the creeds made by uninspired men, and you inquire of him: Who made your book? He replies: Our great and good men. You proceed: Who did they make it for? He answers: For us. You inquire: Who do you mean by that narrow word "us?" He answers: Our church. You press the matter: Who do you mean by that narrow expression "Our church?" He explains: Our brethren. You inquire: Are there no good people only those whom you designate "us," "our church," "our brethren?" He replies: Certainly, there are many others, I doubt not, just as good. You proceed: And was not your book made for them? Certainly not, he replies. Does not your book propose any good thing, or any blessing, for any only those you call "us," "our church," "our brethren?" you inquire. He honestly and truthfully replies: No; it was not made for any body but *us*, and, of course, contains no blessing for any body else.

This is enough against this book and all of the same kind. It is useless to look through them, or to talk of the good things contained in them, or the proportion of truth in them. There is not a grain of benevolence in them for any of the human race outside of the parties for which they were made. What claim, then, has such a book on the attention of mankind? It is nothing but a partisan concern—not made for mankind, but for a party; not intended to bless the human race, but a party; not made with an eye to the happiness of the world, but merely with an eye to the interests of a party.

It has not one spark of divine benevolence, but is confined to the narrowness and selfishness of a religious faction, separated from other religious people by a few human opinions. This is enough against books of this kind. They are too narrow, circumscribed, and limited in their benevolence. Men whose souls have been impressed by the widely-expanded benevolence of the Bible, if for no other reason, on account of their narrowness, selfishness, and partisan character, will go against all such books, living and dying.

Now, in contrast with this, open the Lord's book and read the promise to Abraham—Gen. xxii: 18: "In thee shall all nations be blessed." This promise contained Christ, the Gospel, the Church—in one word, the blessing of the entire new institution. Who did our heavenly Father intend the blessing of this promise or the new institution for? *All the nations of the earth.* It is not for a party, a section, or faction, but for the *human race.* Paul, in commenting on this blessing of the Gospel, or the new institution, styles it "the grace of God," and says, it "has appeared to all men." See Titus ii: 11. In the same spirit, Isaiah, looking down through long centuries to the Messiah, says, "He shall be set for salvation to the ends of the earth." When the Savior was born, the angels sang, "We bring you good news of great joy, which shall be to all people." See Luke xi: 10. The Lord's benevolence is not confined to a party, to any one nation or people, but is to, and for, all people. Hence, in the commission, the Lord commanded the Gospel to be preached to *every creature;* to *all nations;* and Peter, on the first opening out of this great work, said, "The promise is to you, and to your children, and to all them that are far off." This comprehensive and glorious benevolence is in perfect keeping with what has been said in this discourse, of the purpose of God in creating man, in sending the Messiah into the world, and giving us the Scriptures.

This grand system of benevolence and humanity, secured to the world by our most gracious and merciful heavenly Father, has another feature of immense importance that must be noticed here, viz.: It has nothing *sectional* in it. It is not for Eastern, Western, Northern, nor Southern people, in any exclusive sense; but for *all people, of all sections, all nations and languages, alike.* It makes no distinction on account of blood or section of country. The preacher with the love of Jesus, when he meets a human being, need not ask what country he is of, or what nation, but may at once proceed to communicate the good news of the kingdom. God has shown him that he should "call no man common," but that, in *every nation,* and in "all the world," "he who fears God and works righteousness is accepted with him." He is actuated by the highest, the noblest, and broadest benevolence—literally, *the benevolence of God,* extending to the whole race of man.

What a pity it is, what a misfortune to the human race, that the system which the Lord has freely given to all men, should have been checked and hindered in its work by speculations and sophistical theories of men. Yet it must be conceded, that such has been, and is the case. One speculative theory must be mentioned here, as a sample. Though all men of ordinary intelligence know that they are daily *believing certain* things; believing the words of men—uninspired men; relying on them, and acting from their faith, where vast amounts of property and money are involved, there are some men, of fine intelligence in other matters, that claim that they are so peculiarly organized that they can not believe. They claim that they are not credulous, as other men. In hearing such men talk, we are led to pity them as the *unfortunates* of humanity. Men so peculiarly organized that they have no credulity! can not credit truth! can not believe facts! That is singular in the

extreme! Such men could not act as magistrates, for they could not believe the testimony of witnesses. They could not act as jurors, for they could not believe testimony, and decide according to law and testimony. They could not act as judges, for judges must be men who can believe testimony and act on it. They can not act as physicians, for, when sent for, they can not believe that any body is sick, and will not go. It would be difficult to think of any place for men thus peculiarly organized, unless it would be in some benevolent asylum, for they certainly could not be expected to get a living in this world.

The truth in the matter is, that all men, of even common intelligence, *can believe* and *do believe*, as easily as they can and do exercise any function of soul or body. But the *will* has some control over the faith of men. They believe what they are *willing* to believe much more readily, or with much less testimony, than they do what they are not willing to believe. But for a man to be so credulous as to be gulled into the duplicity that he *can not* believe his God, when he knows that he can believe men, is a little too credulous for a Christian. The true state of the case is, that the very men who are trying to make the impression that they have no credulity, are the most gullible men of these times, and, positively, give credit to, and countenance some of, the most incredible, unlikely, and unreasonable things ever reported. They are the most easily-imposed-on, deceived, and deluded men in the world. The best apology out for them is, that some unenlightened preachers have taught that man, unregenerated, can not believe. But if they were only half as industrious in scanning such sophistries as they are in framing excuses for not believing the Bible, they would soon discover the fallacy.

But another man comes up from another angle, with a difficulty of a different nature from the one just considered.

He takes broader ground, and maintains that the unregenerate man *can do nothing*—has *no ability to do any thing*. He claims that he has many profoundly-learned and able preachers on his side. He and the preachers, he claims, even quote Scripture to prove that the sinner can do nothing. They have, thousands of times, quoted the words: "Stand still and see the salvation of the Lord," to prove their position. But there are several things here that ruin their theory: 1. The command, "Stand still," could not consistently be given to persons who have *no ability*. It requires some ability to stand still. A man with no ability to do any thing can not stand still. A dead man can not stand. 2. The command, to "see the salvation of the Lord," implies some ability. A man with no ability can not see. It is implied, in this instance, that those who were the subjects of the command had not only ability to see common things, but to see "the salvation of the Lord." 3. A careful discrimination should constantly be made between *seeing* the salvation of the Lord and *obtaining* it. The command is not to stand still and *obtain* the salvation of the Lord, but *see it*. 4. Another thing of importance with intelligent people is in reference to where the passage may be found. It is generally quoted by the class in question, when they are treating the subject of conversion. Was the language uttered in reference to the conversion of sinners? Did the apostles say to sinners, "Stand still and see the salvation of the Lord?" They never did. This is not the language of an apostle, nor of the New Testament. It is the language of Moses when leading the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, and at the crossing of the Red Sea. These words are found in Ex. xiv: 13. The people had ability and obeyed the command of Moses, and did literally *stand still* and *see* the salvation of the Lord. Moses added: "And the Egyptians, whom you have seen this day, you shall see them again no more for-

ever." When the people found the sea before them, and no escape to the right or left, and a furious army in their rear, they were frightened, and reflected on Moses for involving them in their fearful situation. Moses commanded them to stand still and see the salvation of the Lord. They obeyed the command. They stood still, and saw the sea cleft asunder and a dry passage made for them. But there was not one saved yet. They only *saw* salvation, but had not *obtained it*. The Lord next addressed Moses, saying, "Speak to the children of Israel, that they go forward." Certainly the Lord did not command Moses to say this to people whom he knew had no ability—people who could do nothing! What followed? The people demonstrated that they *had ability*—that they *could do something*. The vast column moved forward till all were safely on the other side—every soul saved, not by *standing still*, but by *going forward*. They received the salvation after they went forward, and then united in the praises of God. The passage, then, instead of proving that the persons addressed could not do any thing, proves that they could do something, and did it, before they were saved. That is not all; when the people went forward, they went forward *in immersion*, and were "all *immersed into Moses*, in the cloud and in the sea." But where is the use in arguing with a man so confused and blinded, so completely deluded by the wicked one, that though he is saying every day of his life, in regard to other matters, "I will do this," and "I will not do that," that he argues that he *can not do any thing?* There is but one step beyond this in delusion, and that is, when the adversary has so completely deceived a man that *he does not believe there is an adversary*. This is the climax in delusion. A man can not go beyond it.

But more time must not now be consumed with these absurd theories. The Bible proceeds with man on the same

principle as man proceeds with his fellow-man; or the same principle, as all the civil laws in the world—the principle that man can *believe* and *obey*. If he could not do this, he would not be man.

The law of Moses was not a universal law; not for all the world, but for the nation of Israel. The New Testament is adapted to and designed for all the world. It is not simply a book for the church, for "us," "our brethren," "our church," but for *the world*. The world is mainly in three divisions: The unbelieving; the believing who are not Christians; not in Christ, and those in Christ. For these three classes the New Testament has also three divisions: The four records of testimony concerning Christ by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These are not, as many style them, "four Gospels," nor "the four Gospels," but four records of testimony concerning the Messiah, written by four different men. These records are all of the same nature, all on the same subject, and evidently all have the same design. When we get the design of one of them, we have the design of all. John, the last one, as arranged in the volume called the "New Testament," and the one last written, informs us what the design was, John xx: 30, 31. He says, "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life through his name." No man can state his purpose, in writing a book, more clearly than this writer does here, and, as before stated, in doing so, he also states the purpose of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. That design is, *that the reader may believe "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."* Whatever else the reader may find in these records, he should constantly bear in mind that the leading design is that *he may believe*. These records of testimony were not made to

prove any doctrine or creed in the world, but to lay before the reader the evidence concerning Jesus, the Anointed Son of God, that he may believe.

Such being the purpose of these records, how appropriate it is that they should appear first in the volume. In this, too, this book proves its adaptation to the world as no other book in the world does. The apartment for the unbeliever meets his eye first, and he finds it adapted to him and prepared for him. The books that men have made have left out this grand department entirely, and passed by the unbelieving, making no provision for them. The creed-makers have been so busily engaged in distinguishing their opinions from those differing from them, that they appear to have overlooked and passed by the unbelieving part of mankind. In the Lord's book, special provision is made for them, and it is the first thing. In making a believer there must be two things: 1. Something to believe. 2. Credible testimony, bringing that something to the human understanding. In the case in hand, the Lord has furnished that which is to be believed—the truth concerning Jesus, that *he is the Christ, the Son of the living God.* This truth is not always found in precisely the same form, or the same words, but always amounting to the same. As the Lord stood on the banks of the Jordan, the Almighty Father embodied it in the following words: "This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased." In the mountain of transfiguration this was repeated, and the following added: "Hear you him." As in the brief but all-important confession made by Peter, Matt. xvi: 16, it reads as follows: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "On this," the Lord says, "I will build my Church," or, "on this rock." This is a very perspicuous statement of the central idea of Christ's religion, the transcendently important truth, to be believed. It is not, Thou art Christ, or Anointed, for others had been an-

ointed; but thou art *the* Anointed, in a much higher sense than any other had ever been. It is not "Son of God," nor "*a* Son of God," for there were other sons of God; but "*the* Son," in a higher sense than any other. It is not "of God," nor "of a God," but "of *the living* God; transcendently above all others called *God*—THE JEHOVAH—THE I AM. The truth to be believed is not that Jesus is Christ, or Anointed, but "*the* Christ, *the* Son of the living God." The records of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are four records of testimony concerning this great truth. Whoever reads these records understandingly, reads them with his eye fixed on this all-absorbing question, Is Jesus the Son of the living God, as they bear on it from first to last?

The Lord having furnished the proposition to be believed, and the testimony on which to believe, how should the preacher go to work to make believers? Should he preach a sermon on the philosophy of faith? Certainly not. A sermon on faith? By no means. Preaching sermons on faith never made a believer in the world. How does a sensible attorney make a jury believe? He delivers no speech on the philosophy of faith, or on faith. How, then, does he make his jury believe? He calls his witnesses and has them give their testimony to the jury. After all the testimony is stated, he makes a speech, summing up and applying the testimony and the law to the case. How should the preacher of Jesus proceed? The people whom he would convince are his jury. The testimony found in the records of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, is the testimony he should lay before them. He should array it, sum it up, apply it to his proposition, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, showing that it is conclusive.

To show the nature of this testimony and its tendency, when properly used, suppose a Jewish rabbi were to step in and say, "Please let me look at your New Testament." A

copy is handed to him. He reads the title page: "The New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." This title is not of inspiration and not correct. "*New* Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," implies an *Old* Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. The Old Testament was not given by Christ, but by Moses. Moses was the mediator of the Old Testament, but Christ of the New. The law, or the first covenant, was by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ. But the Jewish rabbi proceeds to look at the New Testament. He turns to the first of Matthew's record and reads the genealogy of Christ, as probably transcribed from the Jewish records, and the first thing arresting his attention is the fact, that Jesus of Nazareth was born in the lineage, the line, or family from which the Messiah was to come, according to the prophecies. This strikes his mind with much force. "If you please," says he, "let me look a little further." He looks again, and reads that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, as clearly predicted by one of the prophets, and finds the language of the prophet quoted in the narrative. This strikes him with still greater force. He reads on, and finds another and a more remarkable fact, viz., that he was born of a virgin, and the language of the prophet that had many ages before declared that he should be born of a virgin is quoted. This strikes his mind with still greater force. He reads again, finding the account of the jealousy and persecution of Herod, Jesus escaping his wrath by being carried into Egypt, and God calling him out of Egypt after the danger had passed away, corresponding to the language, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." He reads the examination of the sketch concerning John the Immerser, and finds an account of the Elijah that was to come—that he came according to the prediction of the prophet—did the work assigned him—prepared the way before the Lord—prepared a people for the Lord. By

this time his attention is completely engaged, and he is inquiring, "Is it possible that Jesus of Nazareth, whom my nation did and still rejects, has entered by the door of prophecy, and step after step fulfilled the prophecies? Please let me examine a little further," says he. He reads through Matthew's record, and is astonished to find some seventy predictions of the prophets more or less clearly fulfilled on Jesus. His mind is becoming deeply impressed, and the question is frequently in his heart: "Have we not rejected the true Messiah?" He carefully traces Mark's record through. His convictions are deepened and strengthened. He traces through Luke's record, and finds corroboration and confirmation of what had gone before. He is almost ready to yield. He pushes on eagerly through John's testimony, and finds other, fuller, and clearer confirmation. He is sensibly affected with one of the predictions of Jesus, spoken some forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, viz.: "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away captive among all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Our rabbi revolves this in his mind, and quietly reflects on it. "Jesus of Nazareth, whom we Jews rejected, uttered this *forty years before Jerusalem was destroyed.* The devoted city *was invested with armies, it was destroyed;* literally buried in ruins; *not one stone left upon another not thrown down; the Jews have been led away captive among all nations; Jerusalem has been trodden down by the Gentiles for ages past.* All this was, in one short sentence, in prophecy. It is now recorded on the pages of history, and the wonderful events of this prophecy cover over some eighteen centuries! I am fully satisfied," he exclaims. "I believe, with all my heart, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the living God."

But now, that he has examined these holy records of Mat-

thew, Mark, Luke, and John, and become a believer, the next thing that opens to his mind is the question, what must I do, as a believer, to obtain the mercy and favor of that God against whom I have so long and greatly sinned, in my madness and unbelief? "Since this book has led me safely on from the cold and cheerless icebergs of unbelief, to the bright and glorious hope of the faith of the Messiah, I will read on; it may be that it will lead me safely through." He turns over another leaf, to a new department, in the New Testament, erroneously called, in the common version, "The Acts of the Apostles." This book is a record of acts of apostles; only *some* of the acts of *some* of the apostles. But it is more than this; it is a record of the election of Matthias; the descent of the Holy Spirit; the supernatural endowment of the apostles with power from heaven; their first preaching under the last commission; the first conversions; the founding of the Church; a history of the apostolic preaching and practice, and some of the first evangelists, in planting and setting churches in order. Our rabbi reads the first chapter of this book, in which he finds the account of the election of Matthias to supply the vacancy occasioned by the apostasy and fall of Judas from the apostolic office. He finds the college of the apostles thus completed, and all things ready, as Jesus had pointed out before he died and after he rose from the dead. He reads into the second chapter of Acts, and finds the wonderful account of the descent of the Holy Spirit, the endowment of the apostles with power, as Jesus had promised, to guide them into all truth. This all comes right to him. He reads Peter's sermon, directed to the Jews, to convince them that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. "All this," says he, "I believe; but I desire now to know what I must do, as a believer, to obtain pardon and become a disciple of Jesus." He reads a little farther on, and finds the question from

those who heard Peter: "Men and brethren what shall we do?" "That," says he, "is the question to which I desire an answer." He reads on for the answer: "And Peter said to them, Repent, and be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." He praises God for the answer. This begins to clear the way for him. He reads Peter's discourse in the third chapter of Acts, learns what he preached, what the people believed, what they were commanded to do, what it was for, what they were promised. He reads on, follows Philip down to Samaria, noticing the record carefully of all he said, and all the people said and did, learning all about it as found in the eighth chapter of Acts, finding where many, both men and women, became obedient to the faith. In the latter part of this chapter, he finds the account of the conversion of the Ethiopian officer. He notices every particular in the case, what was preached to him, what he believed, what he did, and how he did it. In the ninth chapter he finds the account of the conversion of young Saul, the chief of sinners. This case he notices with great care in every particular. He proceeds on through the tenth chapter, noticing all that was preached, believed, and done, and all the results, in the conversion of the first Gentiles. He reads down through the sixteenth chapter, finding the account of the conversion of Lydia and the jailer, and so on through the book, noticing carefully all that was preached, what was commanded to be believed and done, what was believed and done, what was promised, what was given, and all about it.

From this book he learned what a believer must do to become a Christian, did it, bowed his soul to God, confessed Jesus, was immersed into him, and thus became a disciple. He praised God for the book, that found him in the cold and gloomy regions of unbelief, and raised up his soul by

the mighty faith of the Gospel, and thus, when made a believer, took him by the hand, and guided him into the kingdom of God. But now a new chapter has come. A new want is opened up to him. He wants new directions, showing, as he is now a Christian, how to live as a Christian or a disciple of Christ. He says, "I have found, by perusing my book, all I needed thus far; I will go on, and hope I shall find all I need in time to come." He turns over another leaf, and comes to Paul's letter to the church in Rome, and finds that every word in it is addressed to Christians, or disciples of Christ, those in Christ, showing them how to live as Christians, serve God, and find their way home to the everlasting city; as if God had taken them by the hand, and said, "Come, my dear children, and I will lead you home." As he reads this letter, he praises God for its instructions, comforts, and consolations. He reads Paul's two letters to Corinth, and finds every word addressed to the saints, the people of God, giving them, as the prophet said, "line upon line and precept upon precept," to guide them safely home. He reads the letter to Galatians, the one to the Ephesians, the one to the Philippians, the one to the Colossians, and the two to Thessalonica, and finds that all these letters were addressed to the children of God, and abounding in exhortations, entreaties, admonitions, warnings, threatenings, and promises; cheering, comforting, and encouraging them on their way to heaven. This fills his highest expectations, meets all his wants, and clears his entire pathway through this life and this world onward to his final home. He goes on through the two letters to Timothy, the one to Titus, and the one to Philemon, from the apostle Paul, teaching those young men, preachers of the Word, how to behave themselves in the house of God. He reads through the long and argumentative letter to the Hebrews, converted Israelites, warning them against apostatiz-

ing from the faith, from Christ, and returning to the law of Moses; showing that if they forsake Christ, the great sacrificial offering, that there is no more sacrifice for sins. He passes on through the letter of James, the two of Peter, the three of John, and one of Jude, and finds all, from Romans to Revelation, addressed to the saints, the children of God, teaching them how to serve God, how to please him in all things as his children, and how to obtain the final and eternal salvation.

These holy instructions, "teaching him to live soberly, and righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ," he honestly and faithfully follows for forty years. But now he is an old man, and bending over his staff. He says, "I have found the Lord's book adapted to man. The first department in the four records of testimony, by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, led me to the Lamb of God, and made me a believer on the Savior of the world. The second department, Acts of Apostles, showed me, after I was a believer, the way into the kingdom of Christ, to justification or remission of sins. The epistles of the apostles, addressed to the saints, showed me how, after I had become a Christian, to follow Jesus, to live and serve God as a Christian or a disciple of Christ. These holy instructions I have followed many years, and am now old. I shall not be here long. I should like to have a view of the other side of Jordan, into the sweet fields of Eden. Like Moses, when he ascended Mount Pisgah, he viewed Canaan, though he was not permitted to enter. So I should like to have a view beforehand of the wonderful future." He turns over and reads that wonderful book, Revelation, from the first to the twenty-first chapter, and finds passing before him a grand panoramic view, commencing before the new dispensation, extending down through it, and through

the intermediate state, and terminating in the eternal state, in the holy city, New Jerusalem, which John saw coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. He reads the twenty-first chapter, and the grand description of the final state of the redeemed, where all tears are wiped away, no more sorrowing nor sighing, sickness nor death; where there is access to the river of the water of life, and to the tree of life. He reads the description of the holy city, the final home of the saints, and, in the language of good old Simeon, he exclaims, "It is enough; my eyes have seen the salvation of the Lord; now let thy servant depart in peace."

Thus it is seen, that the Bible is the book for man, adapted to man, giving him a knowledge of his creation, of God's dealings with him for four thousand years, before Christ; the grand series of preparation for the new and better covenant, based on better promises; the full and complete introduction of the new institution. On opening the new covenant, we have found three departments for the three great classes of humanity, the unbelieving, the believing who know not the way to God, and those who are in Christ. The Lord has graciously prepared his divine testimonies, as reported by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, for the unbelieving, that they may have the privilege of believing. This important department is rightly placed first in the volume we now, by common consent, call the New Testament. The second department is a report of the election of Matthias to fill the vacancy occasioned by the apostasy and fall of Judas from the apostolic office, the supernatural endowment of the apostles, their preaching, the first conversions and others afterward, the planting of churches, setting them in order, etc. In this department the believer, who knows not what to do to become a Christian, can learn that which is the first thing before him and all-important to him—the way to God, to

justification, or remission of sins. After a man has found the way to God, and has become a Christian, he needs a guide for his life and practice, as a Christian or a disciple of Christ. In the third department, the letters of the inspired apostles, he finds all this. These letters were all written to the saints, those in Christ. Hence, there is not an effort to make a believer in one of them, nor to show any one how to become a Christian. The entire matter of these letters is to show those who are Christians how to perform their part well, as Christians, that they may reach the heavenly Canaan.

This is the book this world needs. We need not pray to the Lord to make it what it is not, or to give it a power it does not possess, thus offering insult to the author of it. He has made it what he designed it to be, and, as it is, it is adapted to man as he is. Nor need we pray to the Lord to make man something else than he is, till we give him the Gospel. Give him, as he is, the Gospel as it is, as the power of God, to change him and make him what he ought to be. This is the Lord's way of working. He, therefore, sent men to preach the Gospel to every creature; to all nations; to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. Where they went and preached, men were turned to God. Where the Gospel was not, in some form, conveyed to the minds of men, they were never turned to God.

The Bible is the book for man, to make him a believer, show him how to become a Christian after he is a believer, and how to serve the Lord after he is a Christian, and make his way home to the eternal rest. This is the final aim of all the sincere. How we should delight to talk of that final rest!—that home in the everlasting city! and with what delight we should talk of the way leading to it, inquire all about it, and try and make a sure work of finding it!

This is the great matter. It is like a man, sixty years of age, inquiring about Oregon, speaking of its advantages, the health, climate, productions, etc. He appears never to grow weary of talking on the theme. His whole countenance brightens every time the subject comes up, and, as he enlarges on it, he becomes eloquent. He delights even to talk of the way to that country, and has learned all the particulars about the way. You feel amazed, and wonder why a man at his time of life should be so much employed in thinking and talking of that country and the way to it; but, after inquiring more particularly into the matter, you learn that his father, some eighty-five years of age, has gone to that country, and still lives there; that his precious mother, in her advanced years, is also there; that his brothers and sisters have gone there; that his children have left him and gone there. This furnishes a reason for his heart being there, and so much of his conversation about that country, and the way to it. Finally, he tells you that he is going there himself. This makes a full explanation of all his anxieties and solicitudes about that country.

Where are many of our fathers? Many of you would answer, In Abraham's bosom; in paradise; gone to rest. Where are many of the precious mothers? Many of these also are gone to the same place of rest. Where are many of your companions? They, too, are gone there. Where are many of your brothers and sisters? You answer, Gone to the same place of repose. Where are many of your precious children? They have followed. Do you remember how you wept, grieved, and mourned as you committed their bodies to the graves? Can you now live as if you had no thought of them, the state of rest to which they have gone, or the certainty that you shall soon follow? Can you now live as if you never thought of him who consecrated the way

through the veil, and has, for us, entered into the true holy place, with his own blood, to appear in the presence of God for us? Can you live in this world with the certainty in view that you might enter eternity any hour, and yet neither talk, act, or even think of that state, the way leading to happiness, the loved ones gone, or him who died for you? Do you say, "There is time enough yet." How do you know there is time enough yet? How do you know how much time you will need? How do you know how much time will be granted? These momentous matters are all in the dark. You have not one ray of light on them. You are here now—hear the way of life pointed out, and can come and walk in it. "*Now* is the accepted time," says the Lord. "To-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts," is the reading in the book of God. Will you hear his voice and live? Will you accept life and be happy forever? or will you die in your sins and forever lament your folly?

Be entreated by your best friends, by the love of Christ, by the tender mercies of our God, by all that is sacred, lovely and endearing, to turn to the Lord while it is an accepted time and day of salvation. Commit your all into the gracious and merciful hands of him who has loved you, endured the cross, despised the shame, and laid down his life for you. He is your best friend, your only Savior and Redeemer, and if, in madness, you turn away from him and dash the cup of salvation from your lips, despise his goodness, love and mercy, you will lament your folly forever. In one hour the whole scene may be changed with you—the other side of the picture turned to your eye. Turn now, learn to love righteousness and the God of righteousness; to love purity and holiness, the pure and the holy, and the God of purity and holiness. Assimilate yourself to

the good, the true, the lovely and excellent of heaven and earth, and thus prepare for the holy, the heavenly and sublime associations of the eternal world. To God, who loved us, and to the Lamb that was slain for us, be the glory, the dominion, the honor and power, forever and ever!

SERMON, No. VIII.

THEME.—THE SIMPLICITY OF THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST

TEXT—" . . . . Wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."—ISAIAH xxxv: 8.

THE Gospel of Christ was not intended by its Divine Author for a few learned or wise men, but for "every creature," learned or unlearned, wise or foolish. That which is intended for *the people* at large—the great mass of mankind—in the nature of the case, must be simple, easy of comprehension, and applicable to the people. It must be of such a nature that the people can lay hold of it without long, deep, and profound research. This is evident from some scriptures now to be introduced. Gal. i: 8, Paul says, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach to you any other Gospel than that which we have preached, let him be accursed. As we said before, so even now I say again, if any one preaches to you any other Gospel than that which you have received, let him be accursed." This is an apostolic and divine anathema. It ought to be considered with great care. The intention of it is to preserve the Gospel in its purity, as the Lord gave it, without being mutilated or in any way perverted. It was intended for the eyes of preachers of the Gospel, to make them feel the awful responsibility of hand-

ling that Word which may not be mutilated, corrupted, or perverted by man or angel, without incurring the curse of Heaven.

In connection with this language of the Apostle Paul, turn and read, near the close of the New Testament, "I testify to every man that hears the words of the prophecy of this book, if any one add to these things, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any one take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God will take away his part from the tree of life, and from the holy city; which things are written in this book." These utterances are full of meaning, and placed at the close of the book to warn every one of the terrible doom of the man who shall add any thing to or take any thing from this book. Is it claimed that this is simply said of the Book of Revelation? That may be; but is it not equally true of every part of the Book of God? May we add to the writings of Matthew, Mark, Luke, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude, but not to the writings of John? By no means. We may not add to any thing the Lord has said, pervert it, corrupt it, or preach any other Gospel. If we do, the curse of Heaven will fall on us.

We connect two more passages with these. The Lord says, "He who believes not shall be condemned." Mark xvi: 16. Again: "He who believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." John iii: 36. Stop and think on the awful import of these words. They need no explaining. Their clear and terrible meaning is the first thing that strikes the attention of every one. He who believes not the Gospel shall be condemned. He who preaches any other Gospel shall be accursed. He who adds any thing to it shall have the plagues recorded in it added to him. He who shall take any thing from it shall have his part taken out of the book of life, and out of the

holy city. The following conclusions flow legitimately from these premises:

1. The Lord could not consistently condemn a preacher for preaching another Gospel, perverting the true Gospel, adding to it or taking from it, if he had not made it so easy of comprehension, clear and intelligible, that the preacher capable of preaching at all can preach it as the Lord gave it, adding nothing to it, taking nothing from it, neither perverting or corrupting it. What he could not do consistently, he could not do at all. It is, therefore, claimed that the Gospel is thus plain, and that the curse of Heaven will fall on the man who preaches any other Gospel, mutilates or corrupts the true one.

2. The Lord could not consistently condemn a man for not believing the Gospel, if he had not made it sufficiently clear, intelligible, and credible, so that, by treating the subject fairly, a man could believe it. It is claimed, therefore, that the Gospel is thus clear, intelligible, and credible, and that the Lord will condemn the man who does not believe it.

These deductions contain the theme for the balance of this discourse. Some man objects and insists that the Gospel can not be thus plain and intelligible, or we would not have so many sorts of preachers, doctrines, and churches. These different sorts of doctrines, preachers, and churches may present a difficulty hard to explain, but furnish no refutation of the ground taken in reference to the simplicity of the Gospel. It might turn out, on careful examination, that these differences are not about the Gospel, or any thing in it. No matter what they are about, they do not prove that the Gospel is not clear and intelligible. The prophet Isaiah considered the way plain, for he said, "The wayfaring men, though fools, should not err therein." See Isaiah xxxv: 8. Our Lord considered the way to God

plain, for he said, "They who seek shall find." See Matt vii: 8.

It is not some man's opinion that is here placed before you, nor some man's comment. The matter on which a man is to make up his mind is the clear and unequivocal statements of Scripture. Are they true? Does he believe them? The prophet looks down through seven hundred and fifty years, to the way to God, under the new economy, and, in the most unequivocal manner, says, "The wayfaring men, though fools, should not err therein." And the Lord, in emphatic terms, says, "They who seek shall find." This ought to be an end of controversy, on all this protracted seeking, to find the way to God, or how to become a Christian. "But," says a man, "I have known many persons who have been seekers for years, and have not found the Savior." Nothing of this kind can disprove the words of the prophet or of Jesus. These words still stand true, and will till the day of judgment. The Lord did not intend that men should find who would not regard his directions *where* and *how* to find, but seek him *where* and *in a way* in which the Lord never promised to be found. When a clear description is given, and full information where and how any thing may be found, and a man goes somewhere else and seeks it, he ought not to be surprised if he does not find.

But now the question comes up for our consideration, whether it turned out as the prophet and the Lord said. When the new and living way was opened up, and the door of the kingdom thrown wide open, did sinners have protracted seeking and many of them fail to find the way? Let us examine. At the opening of the kingdom, on the great Pentecost, the people heard one discourse, and inquired, "What shall we do?" In one sentence the apostle answered their question; told them what to do, so that they understood him, did what he commanded, and the same day

became Christians, and entered into the kingdom. We find no account of a seeker going away seeking, or a mourner going away mourning. Every man and woman who inquired the way, was shown the way; told what to do to be accepted of the Lord, did it the same day, and entered the new covenant. Thus the Gospel is easily understood and easily obeyed. This fulfills the words of Jesus: "They who seek shall find." What a wonderful contrast this case makes with much of the procedure in modern times! They talk in some of these modern establishments, called churches, of "Pentecostal occasions." But when did they ever have a vast number of "mourners," "seekers," "inquirers," or "anxious persons" come to them, inquiring, "What shall we do?" and proceed forthwith, in one single sentence, to tell them what to do, so that they could do it the same day, and enter the covenant and not a mourner left mourning, or a seeker go away seeking? They can tell you how many anxious persons there were, how many "experienced a change," or how many were "hopefully converted," and, sometimes, how many were "powerfully converted;" but a case where every one was shown the way to God, what to do to obtain pardon, so that each one did it the same day, and entered into the covenant with God, is what they can not do. The plain truth is, they have no plan of salvation; no definite, clear, and intelligible terms with which a soul of the race can comply and become a Christian. It is as clear as sunbeams that the apostles had definite, clear, and intelligible terms of salvation, which they could place before men, with which they could forthwith comply and come to the promise of pardon. Hence, when the three thousand inquired, "What shall we do!" the apostle had an answer, which he could utter, in one single sentence, definitely, clearly, and intelligibly informing them what to do, so that they understood it, and did it the same day, and entered the kingdom of God

Not a seeker went away seeking, nor a mourner went away mourning, nor a single failure of any sort.

If any man thinks this is making too much of a single case, turn to the next case, in the apostolic practice—Acts iii: 19—and find the directions there given, and see how many seekers went away seeking, and he will find no account of a single case of the kind. In a single sentence, the apostle told them what to do; they did it, and were immediately accepted. There was not a single failure. There was no such thing as honest people, seriously and earnestly trying to become Christians, and utterly failing. Turn to the eighth chapter and follow the evangelist of Jesus Christ, and you find him showing every man and woman that came to him what to do to come to the Lord, and not a failure is made. Every sincere inquirer is told how to become a Christian, shown how to enter into the covenant, on the first interview with the preacher. Read on and examine the account of the preaching to the Ethiopian officer, treasurer of Queen Candace, and, during the first interview, Philip points him to the Lamb of God, shows him the way into the kingdom, receives him, and he goes on his way rejoicing. This preacher had definite, clear, and intelligible terms of pardon; presented them to the officer, who at once complied with them, and was accepted of the Lord.

The same was true in the case of young Saul, as recorded in the ninth chapter of Acts. Ananias was sent to him to tell him what he must do. As soon as he reached the room where he was, in the first sentence he uttered he told him what he must do. It was definite, clear, and intelligible. He rose forthwith, did what he was commanded, and was pardoned. Though he was the chief of sinners, he did not have to wait a single day, but rose at once and yielded himself to the divine commandment. Nor was there any more delay when Peter, for the first time, appeared before

the Gentiles. Though they had never heard a Gospel sermon, the apostle laid the matter before them, and showed them the way to God. They followed his instructions, turned to the Lord and entered into the covenant at once, and rejoiced in the salvation of the Lord. Not a seeker or mourner went away seeking or mourning, but every honest, inquiring soul that desired it found the Lord. So it turned out in every instance under the labors of the apostles and first evangelists. They never failed, in any instance, to show the poor sinner the way to God, where he was honestly inquiring. They never made a failure. Indeed, in that day, they did not have any preachers who could not show a sinner the way to God. The Lord never called or sent any man to preach who *could not*, or *would not*, set forth the terms of pardon.

In one round sentence, from the opening of the kingdom on Pentecost, to the final amen of the Apocalypse, there is not an intimation of a single instance in which any sincere person was sent away seeking, or in which the preacher had to see the person the second time to show the way of salvation. In every instance, a sincere person, honestly desiring to become a Christian, was told what to do at once. The protracted seeking, and the numerous failures to find, of our time, are wholly unknown to the Scriptures.

In contrast with this, how stands the matter in modern times? A protracted meeting commences, or, more popularly, a revival. Preaching, praying, exhorting, and singing are all brought to bear. The Lord created man with religious faculties. In such revivals these religious faculties become roused, and persons rush forward as "seekers," "inquirers," or "mourners." They cry out, "What shall we do?" The apostolic answer is entirely ignored. Not a word is said about it. The sinner is encouraged, by telling him, "They that seek shall find," and "They that mourn

shall be comforted." He is exhorted to pray, to give up his whole heart, to keep back nothing. In the prayers, the Lord is entreated to "come now," "come right down," to "come with converting power," etc. The honest seeker, to the best of his ability, unites in these prayers, and is expecting an immediate power from God to perform a miraculous change in him, and make him a Christian. All the preaching, exhorting, praying, and singing lead him to expect this. It may be that some persons less sedate, thoughtful, and considerate, but more frivolous, wild, and thoughtless, rise and speak of having "experienced a change," and "received a hope." The others, more solid, grave, and sober-minded, looked for the Lord to come, but knew nothing of his coming; looked for a miraculous change, but none came; tried to get a hope, but got none. They "experienced" nothing but a sad disappointment.

The preacher is now fully out at sea. He goes not to his Bible, but proceeds to encourage them, by telling how long he, or some one else, was a seeker; that the Lord has his own good time for doing his work; that they are probably keeping back something; that they have not given up the whole heart, or, in other words, that they have not been honest in the matter. They know they are sincere in the matter, and willing to humble themselves, or do any thing to please God, and return again the next night. Similar prayers are offered, and the exercises much the same as before. Thus thousands of persons, as sincere as the world contains, have been kept going and going, seeking and seeking, mourning and grieving, night after night, and week after week, and, in some instances, year after year, and found nothing. They have been disappointed and deceived in that which was dearer to them than all things besides! Who is to blame for all this? Not the Gospel, for it has its definite, clear, simple, and intelligible directions to the sinner, or

conditions on which the Lord promises pardon. No uncertain sound in it. Not these sincere, inquiring persons, for they heard the preacher, and did every thing he told them to do. Who, then, is to blame for this wonderful failure? The preachers, who had the New Testament lying before them, and the apostolic directions to sinners, and *would not follow these directions.* These are the men who are responsible, and will be held responsible in the day of judgment. An awful responsibility it will be, too. It is difficult to conceive how a man can incur a greater responsibility than to misguide the sincere, the candid, and honest; deceive them and utterly disappoint them in their efforts to find the way to God. What a responsibility has been incurred in this matter. The whole country abounds with men and women as sincere, candid, and honest as can be found on earth, who have been seekers, mourners, done every thing the preachers told them to do as faithfully as human beings could, and continued an astonishing length of time, and found nothing; demonstrated this system to be a failure. They know they have been disappointed, deceived, deluded. They have, in many instances, turned away in utter disgust, became hardened and abandoned sinners. Many of them have abandoned all churches, all preaching, and are out at sea without chart or compass.

This modern, dark, gloomy, and unintelligible system of seeking without inquiring of the Lord, in his clear, definite, and intelligible instructions, where he will be found, and where he has promised the salvation of the soul from sin, is responsible for all this. There never was a failure in the Lord's plan. The failure is in men, who either *do not know* the Lord's plan, or *will not practice it.* There can be no excuse in the case. In the nature of the case, the Lord would not make the way of salvation so dark, mystical, and difficult that honest and sincere people *could not* find

it, and then *condemn them for not finding it.* The very idea of men and women entering an institution, and then not knowing how to show other people the way in, is utterly ridiculous. There is, probably, no institution into which men and women have entered, in this world, and could not show others the way in, except some of the dark, misty, and foggy systems of religion. Men and women get into these, and can not tell how they got in, or how another person can get in! This is confusion worse confounded, darkness that may be felt.

There is nothing clearer to the man acquainted with the New Testament than that, in the time of the apostles, any person who desired to be a Christian could forthwith turn to God and enter the covenant. No such thing is known to the Scriptures as persons desiring to become Christians, and seeking to do so, but could not. This is implied by all the invitations of the Gospel. Whoever will, let him take of the water of life freely, is the very spirit of the Gospel. Thousands of these modern seekers die seeking, without even the imagination that they have found pardon. This is not the way of the Lord, nor even a wise human device, but one of the weakest, most mischievous deceptions and extensive failures ever known. Thousands of people, in all directions, need go to no man to tell them, to no preacher nor private person, for they have *tried it,* and know for themselves that they have *tried honestly,* and found nothing. They know what sort of promises were made to them, encouragements held out and advices were given, and they know that they have received nothing; that they have been utterly disappointed, misled, and deceived. This much is not a matter of *opinion* with them, but of *personal knowledge. They know it.* The injury done to these is incalculable. In numerous instances the injury can never be mended. Many will go no farther, but put all religion and the Bible itself on the

same footing, and never again have any confidence in religious instruction.

But some man is saying by this time, If the Gospel is such a plain matter, or if you have any thing clearer, plainer, or more intelligible than what we have tried, let us have it. To this, attention shall now be given. Beginning, then, at the starting point, what must a man believe? "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you might *believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God*, and that believing you might have life through his name." See John xx: 30, 31. As Philip was preaching Jesus to the Ethiopian officer, they came to a certain water, and the officer said, "See, here is water; what hinders me from being immersed?" The reply of the evangelist was, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." He said, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." See Acts viii: 37. Paul says, "If you will confess with your mouth, that Jesus is Lord, and will believe in your heart that God has raised him from the dead, you shall be saved." These plain Scriptures show beyond controversy what a man must believe to become a Christian. He is not required to believe this creed, that creed, or the other creed; the thirty-nine articles of one, nor the twenty-five articles of another; the Westminster, nor the Philadelphia Confession; this theory, that theory, or the other theory; but the truth concerning the living, ascended, exalted, and glorified Jesus, who has gone into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name in heaven and on earth. The faith of a Christian does not center in a few articles of opinion, drawn up by a few uninspired men, setting forth the difference between their opinions and the opinions of some other uninspired men, but in the ever-

living person of our Lord Jesus the Christ. This explains how it was that so many heard the Gospel and believed to the salvation of their souls in a single day. They believed on a person, the glorious person of the Messiah. They could hear of him and believe on him in a single day, and become ready to place themselves under him, ready to be taught by him and follow him.

But a man complains that he can not tell what repentance is; that the preachers refer to lexicons and learned authorities, and he can not tell what is right. There are but few men who have not already a pretty good idea what repentance is. This can be easily demonstrated. Suppose a man should be immersed and unite with a church, but, in a very short time, be seen reeling from intoxication, using profane and obscene language; what would men of the world say of him? They would, without hesitation, say he never repented. How do they know, if they do not know what repentance is? The truth is, they know what repentance is, or, at least, the fruits that ought to proceed from it. They understand that it ought to be such a change, in some way, whether they can describe it or not, will result in a good life in time to come. This is true; it is such a change of mind as will result in a good life. No matter whether you know the learned definitions or not, nor whether you can explain precisely *how* the change is; you know it must be such a change in a man as will result in a good life. If the good life does not follow—no matter how much a man tells of wonderful changes, feelings, and emotions within him; of great heart-work, experience, and joys—nobody believes he has truly repented. No man in our day will have much confidence in any great work of grace *within a man*, while there is *no change without*. This shows that there is a pretty correct understanding what repentance is; that it is a change in the mind sufficient to change the life. If a man is trav

eling for some city, but on a wrong road, he will not turn and take another road till he is convinced that he is going a wrong road—till his mind is changed in regard to the road; nor will any intelligent man believe there is much change in his mind so long as he persists in traveling on the wrong road. But when he turns and earnestly pursues another road, all admit that there is a change in his mind. So, when the sinner turns from his sins and travels another road, there is no doubt about the change in his mind.

But it is objected that one preacher says immersion is baptism; another, sprinkling; and another, pouring; and they resort to lexicons, translations, historians, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew; and in the midst of all this, says a man, "I can not determine what is baptism." At first sight, this has the appearance of a considerable perplexity; but there is an easy way of righting all this, to which we will now resort. Dismiss from your mind all new translations; trouble yourself no more about lexicons; turn your ear, *for the present*, away from all histories, except the Bible; nor shall you be troubled with one word from Greek, Latin, or Hebrew; you may throw aside the word "immerse." Now, will you hear the common version of King James? "I will," says a reader. All right. To the common version, then, we go. Where, then, in the common version do we read of sprinkling for baptism? Do we not read that the Holy Spirit was "shed forth?" We do; but "shed forth" is not *sprinkled*. And if it were, it would be the *Holy Spirit that was sprinkled*, not water; nor is there any thing about baptism in it. There is no sprinkling *for baptism* in the common version, nor any other. Where, then, do you find pouring for baptism in the common version? We read that "the Holy Spirit was *poured out*." True, but "poured" there does not mean *baptized*, or the Holy Spirit was baptized, for the Holy Spirit was "poured out." This *pouring* was not baptizing. You

can find both *sprinkling* and *pouring* in the common version, but that is not *baptizing*, nor is either word used in the sense of that institution, nor for *baptism*.

Now, be careful and note down what you do find in the common version. What was the element used in baptizing? When the Lord was baptized, he "went up straightway out of the *water*." See Matt. iii: 16. This points to water as the element. "John was baptizing in Enon, near Salem, because there was much *water* there." John iii: 23. This also points to water as the element. Philip "came to a certain *water*." Acts viii: 36. The officer said, "See, here is water," and "they both went down into the *water*" (verse 38), and "came up out of the water" (verse 39). Peter said, "Can any man forbid *water*, that these should not be baptized?" Acts x: 47. These all point to the same element —water. This much is then settled.

What is the next thing to inquire about? The *quantity* of the element used. Is there any thing about this? Why was John baptizing in Enon, near Salem? "Because there was *much* water there." See John iii: 23.

Is there any thing in the common version about *where* they found the water? Is there any thing about *bringing* water to baptize? Nothing. Is there any thing said about having the water in a bowl or any similar vessel? Not a word. Do we find any thing about baptizing in a room, or in a house? Not a word. They were baptized of John *in Jordan*, as we learn (John iii: 6); "in the river of Jordan" (Mark i: 6); in Enon (John iii: 26). As Philip and the officer went on their way, "they came unto a certain water." This shows where they found the water. They found it in its *native place*. It was not brought to them; they went to it.

As all the surroundings throw some light on the subject, it will be proper to inquire what they did just previous to

baptizing. Philip and the officer "came unto a certain water." See Acts viii: 36. Where did that *place* them? Certainly, at it. What next? "They both went down into the water" (verse 38). But our preacher explains "into" there to mean *at* or *near by*. You have forgot that we are to stand by the common version. It says, "they came unto a certain water;" that is, *to it*, or *at it*. They then "went *down into* the water," both Philip and the eunuch. Down into the water means more than at it. Down *into it* gets the person in the right element and place, ready for baptizing; "and he baptized him." How was that done? What did the evangelist do to the candidate?

Paul says, Colossians ii: 12, "you are *buried* with him in baptism." That is a plain transaction. Any man, learned or unlearned, can tell when that is done. Romans vi: 4, he says "we are *buried* with him by baptism." Any person can tell whether that is done or not, if he is an eye-witness.

What followed after baptizing? Philip and the eunuch "came *up out of* the water." That was a plain affair. Any person will readily see how that was done.

What resulted from the baptizing? The body *was washed*. See Heb. x: 22.

In sprinkling or pouring water on a candidate for baptism, the following items are out of place:

1. They do not generally find the water in its *native place*.
2. They do not go where there is *much water*.
3. They do not generally "come unto a certain," but have a little water *brought unto them*.
4. They do not generally go *down into the water*.
5. They do not *bury in baptism*.
6. They do not *come up out of the water*.
7. The body is not *washed with water*.

Those who immerse go *unto the water*, where there is *much*

water, down into the water, bury in baptism, come up out of the water, and the body is washed with water. When this is done, the controversy about the *action* of baptism in the mind and conduct of the candidate is at an end. The conscience is at rest, and no further doubt remains in regard to it. This is not the case when sprinkling or pouring is used as baptism. Here the mind is continually unsettled, specially if the party reads or hears any thing on immersion. The plainness of the New Testament on this subject is such that, if any person follows its simple teaching, taking the obvious sense, there will never be any doubt left to harass and make the conscientious person unhappy. This is sufficient for any one honestly striving to do the will of God. If the heart is right in the sight of God, under the power of the faith of Christ, the belief *with all the heart* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and the repentance strong enough to result in a future good life, when the subject is "buried in baptism," there will be no further fears, doubts, or scruples about the action of baptism.

Some one responds, "Even admitting that the action is plain, the preachers differ about the *design,* and I know not how to settle the point." That is also settled in the New Testament as clearly as any other thing can be or ever has been. All we have to do is honestly to give up to, and be instructed wholly by the inspired Scriptures. Start anew, as if you had never heard one word on the subject, and inquire *what the will of the Lord is.* Consider the following:

1. Romans vi: 3, we read of being "immersed into Christ Jesus." Gal. iii: 27, we read of being "immersed into Christ." What is immersion into Christ equivalent to? Though nothing but immersion is mentioned here as the act in which persons are transferred into Christ, it is not *immersion alone,* or immersion without its proper antecedents, viz., faith and repentance. Without faith and repentance, no

person is a proper subject for baptism or at all fit for the sacred rite. This is what is here meant by "the proper antecedents." What is meant by the words "into Christ"? The meaning is, into the Church; into union, communion, and fellowship with Christ; into the kingdom; into the possession and enjoyment of all its rights, privileges, hopes, and blessing. In amount, it is the same as into remission of sins; into justification or reconciliation; for the man "in Christ" is pardoned, justified, and reconciled. He is adopted into the heavenly family. Baptism is, then, the last step, or the consummating act, in entering the kingdom.

Take another passage: "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." John iii: 5. That "born of water" is a figurative expression for *baptism*, is admitted by all the authorities of note, and known to every man who has even a tolerable knowledge of religious literature. That Luther, Calvin, and Wesley so understood it and so commented on it, is an undeniable matter of fact. That this passage is quoted and applied to baptism in the Episcopalian Prayer Book, the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and Methodist Discipline, any one can see by referring to those books. What is the amount of entering into the kingdom of God? It is the same as entering into the Church of Christ, or into remission of sins or state of justification; for every one in the kingdom is in the Church, in Christ, pardoned, justified. Here the Lord then connects it with the work of the Spirit; for "born of the Spirit" is simply *made a believer;* or "begotten by the word of truth," or "through the Gospel," the words of the Spirit. "Born of the Spirit" is *made a believer*, and "born of water" is baptism. The Lord, therefore, connects the work of the Spirit, in making a believer, and baptism together, and thus declares that, "unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the

kingdom of God." So it stood then, and so it ought to be now.

This is the same in substance as the commission—Mark xvi: 16—"He that believes and is immersed shall be saved." Here we have the literal words, "believe" and "immerse," instead of the figurative words, "born of water and of the Spirit," and connecting the same two things, *belief* and *immersion*, together in order to the same end. Find out what the faith is for, in this sentence, or what it is in order to, and you find out what the immersion is for, or is in order to. The same connection that shows what one is in order to, shows what the other is in order to. *They are both in order to salvation.* Let us discriminate, the salvation here spoken of is not the eternal salvation; for many men believe, and are immersed, who go away into sin and never obtain the eternal salvation. It is pardon—an immediate salvation from sin. He that believes and is immersed shall be pardoned. This is the same in substance as the other passages consulted; for saved or pardoned implies "in Christ," or "in the Church," or kingdom; for all who are saved are in Christ, in the Church, in the kingdom.

Acts ii: 38 is the same in substance: "Repent and be immersed every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." "In order to the remission of sins," or "into the remission of sins," is the same in amount as into justification, into reconciliation, or into Christ; for all who have remission of sins are justified, are in Christ, in the Church, in the kingdom, having been immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. This is the reason why we have the words in the commission: "Immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." It is into the new

state or relation, union with the Father, union with the Son, and union with the Holy Spirit, which, in substance, is the same as in Christ, in the Church, in the kingdom; for all who are immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, are in Christ, in the Church, in the kingdom, or they are pardoned and adopted.

"Immersed into one body"—1 Cor. xii: 13—is the same in substance, for all in the "one body" are in the kingdom, pardoned, justified. All these passages show that immersion is the initiatory rite, the act in which the transfer is made "into Christ," "into one body," "into the kingdom of God," "into remission of sins," "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," amounting to the same as into a state of justification. In the act of believing, the sinner is only prepared in his heart for the transfer into the one body, or into the kingdom, but not actually transferred. In the act of repenting, the sinner is prepared only in his life or character for the transfer into one body, into the kingdom, or into remission of sins, but not actually transferred. But in the act of immersion the penitent, whose heart has been prepared for the transfer into the new state by faith, and whose life has been prepared for the transfer by repentance, is, in truth and in fact, transferred "into Christ," "into one body," "into the kingdom of God," "into the remission of sins," "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

You, therefore, never read of *believing* into one body, *repenting* into one body, or *praying* into one body. The reason is that, by the acts of believing, repenting, praying or communion, no one is transferred *into the one body*. Believing, repenting, praying, communion, etc., are all right, and *must be* in their place; but no one of them is the initiatory rite, or the act in which the transfer into the new state or relation is made. Believing goes before the transfer, and

prepares the sinner, in heart, for the transfer. Repentance goes before the transfer, and prepares the sinner, in life, for the transfer. Praying and communion, singing and rejoicing, are acts of devotion for those already transferred, or those in the one body—in the kingdom. Immersion is the act in which the transfer is made. Hence, persons are "immersed *into* one body," "*into* the remission of sins," "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" but they are never said to "believe *into* one body," "*into* the remission of sins," or "*into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

This accounts for another thing, viz.: that we are to be immersed *but once*. If immersion were in the Church, if it were a "religious duty," a "Church ordinance," a "Christian duty," there would be set times when it should be performed, as the communion, again and again. But this is not the case. By common consent, all agree that it is never to be repeated. The reason of this is, we enter into the one body, or kingdom, *but once*. The act or rite in which we are transferred into the new state is never repeated, because we never enter into Christ, into the body or name, but once. The rite or act in which we enter is, therefore, never needed but once.

If any one of our hearers is still troubled about the *design* of immersion, please turn to the words, "Repent and be immersed," and leave the word immerse out for the time being, and read the passage without it, and see if you can determine what repentance is for or in order to. No doubt, you will find the design of it in an instant. Thus read it now and look at it: "Repent every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins." What is the repentance in order to? You answer, "In order to the remission of sins." Now, leave out the word "repent," and read again. The same words that told what repentance was in

order to, will now tell what immersion is in order to. It will then read, "Be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins." Then, certainly, when you have both repentance and immersion, the same connecting words tell what they both stand for or in order to.

If you desire to examine the matter in the simplest form possible, turn to the commission—Mark xvi: 16—and try it in the same manner. Let us see if we can learn what faith or believing is in order to or for. To this end we will read the passage without the words "and be immersed," so as to keep the eye on *believing* and find out precisely the design of *it*. It will then read, "He that believeth shall be saved." What is the believing for or in order to? To being *saved* Now let us read the passage without the word "believeth," and inserting the words omitted before, and the same words that told what believing is for will tell what immersion is for. It will then read, "He that is immersed shall be saved." What is the immersion in order to or for? To being saved. When believing and being immersed are both inserted, as the Lord arranged them, the words that tell what each is for, separately, tell with as much accuracy what both are for when used together. In the same sentence, in the same words, the Lord tells what both believing and being immersed are in order to or for. They are both in order to salvation. In the same way, the apostle—Acts ii: 38—in the same sentence, in precisely the same words, tells us what repentance and immersion are in order to. They are two steps in the same divine process, in order to the same end—pardon or justification.

"I should not know," says a man, "what church to join, if I should concede that all is plain thus far." There need be no trouble about that. Follow out the Scriptures that have been brought to your view, obey the Gospel, and thus

enter the Church of Christ, and then unite with the most convenient congregation of the members you can find, and remain with them till you die. You ought not to belong to any other body, or kingdom, than the body of Christ.

"But how would I decide what creed to adopt?" There need be no trouble about this. All parties agree that the creed the nearest like the Bible is the nearest right. The reason of this is, that the Bible *is right*. Then, if the creed the nearest like the Bible is the *nearest* right, and will do at all, because it is so *near* right, the Bible itself, which *is precisely right*, will do! If it is safe to adopt a creed *nearly* like the Bible, and consequently *nearly right*, it is infallibly safe to adopt the Bible, which is *precisely right*.

"But I can not understand the whole Bible." No matter if you can not understand half of it. There is not one ray of light from heaven for the children of men, except what comes from the Bible. What understanding you have of the Bible, or what light you have received from it, directly and indirectly, is all the light you have shining along your pathway to the skies; and what light you shall, directly and indirectly, derive from the same divine source, is all the light you will ever have to guide you to the everlasting city.

"But why did not somebody among the great men, good and true, who have lived in the last three hundred years, find out these things and adopt the Bible as their only guide," says one, "before our time?" It would be hard to tell why. It is hard to tell why the art of printing was not discovered till a modern date; why they did not make gunpowder at an earlier day, or in some other country; why the wisdom of the world failed to apply steam-power before the year 1800; and why railroads and telegraphs were never brought into use till our day. It would be equally hard to give the reason why a thousand other things were not discovered sooner. Why did not some mighty reformer rise

before Luther, in Germany; before Calvin, in France; or Wesley, in England? The human mind is so constituted that it can not bound from the depths of Romish darkness and, at one single leap, reach the full-orbed light of apostolic times in religious matters. It required many efforts, in different parts of the world, to reach the grand consummation The truth is, at times, men did appear to see the ground, but they did not find strength to stand up to it and maintain it. Chillingworth is probably the author of the sublime declaration: "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants." But neither he, nor his friends who admired his statement, appeared to appreciate what was contained in it.

John Wesley said, commending his General Rules for his "societies," as he styled the little parties with which he first commenced holding meetings for prayers, for a deeper work of grace, "most of which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, which is the sufficient rule and the infallible rule both for our faith and practice." In the Methodist Discipline, the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and the Episcopalian Prayer Book, we have the following: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary for salvation, so that whatever is not read therein, or may not be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith or thought necessary to salvation." On the fifth page of Wesley's Notes to his new translation of the New Testament, he says: "Would to God that all party names were forgot, and that we, as humble, loving disciples, might sit down together at the Master's feet, read his Holy Word, imbibe his Spirit, and transcribe his life in our own." Numerous utterances of this description are found in the writings of the most distinguished men who lived from one to two hundred and fifty years ago. The quotations just made are from memory, and may not be

precisely word for word, but are, in substance, correct. Will you please hear Paul on the same subject? "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work."—2 Tim. iii: 16. What more can the man of God need than the teaching, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, thus being *thoroughly furnished for every good work.* Thus has our kind heavenly Father fitted his children to serve him and prepare themselves for glory and honor. What an act of rebellion it is, on the part of any man or set of men, to assume that the law of God is not sufficient for the government of the saints, and to guide them to peace and happiness, and assume that uninspired men can make a law sufficient for this purpose, and undertake to do it! Yet, this is done in every instance where a human creed is imposed on men for their government or guide.

In this great matter of man's salvation, there should be no risks taken, no experiments made, no trifling. Each person has but the one life to live in this state, but one soul to be saved or lost, but one heaven to be gained or missed, and there should be no uncertainty in the matter. Our heavenly Father has made a will; and if he has not set out the matter in his will, told us how to gain the inheritance, then no one can tell us how. If he has not given us instructions to guide us to glory and honor, no man can give us instructions. When his Son, our Lord, Emanuel, God with us, was transfigured in the presence of three of his disciples as witnesses, the Jehovah said, "This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased; hear you him." This commandment, to "hear him," can be carried out in no way but by adhering to what he has authorized to be said, as we find it recorded in Scripture. He says himself, "I am the way,

the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but by me." Again he says, "I if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me."

The time has now come, in the good providence of God, when the teaching of our Lord and his apostles is to be separated from the teachings and commandments of men, and when our Lord Jesus the Christ is to be held up and an effort made to draw all men to him. Those for him, his Gospel, his teaching, and that of his apostles, are now calling for his friends to come out, stand by him, and rally to his standard, maintain his Gospel and teaching, take on them his name, and stand up for every thing as it came from him and his inspired apostles. If he is not an infallible guide, there is no infallible guide. If the teaching of Jesus and his apostles is not infallibly safe, then there is no safe teaching. If it will not guide us to heaven and eternal felicity, then there is no teaching that will guide us there.

Take, then, the teaching, the divine and infallible teaching of Jesus and the apostles, read it, fill your memory with it, cherish it in your heart, meditate on it, delight in it, love it, and follow it with your whole mind and strength, and it will guide you peacefully, joyfully, and happily home to the haven of everlasting rest. Commend this teaching to your children, and children's children, that they may love and follow it when you are gone to rest. Commend it to the world around you, and exhort them to transmit it from generation to generation till it shall reach the last child that shall be born of our race. It is our only source of instruction in the way of life. Directly and indirectly, all our light must come from it.

Thus we have shown, by many infallible proofs, that the way to God is plain—so plain, so simple, so easily understood, that no one need err. All truth in religion lies within the Bible. When it is our guide in religious mat-

ters, we are sure of being right, and need not err. It is our creed to be believed, our chart to guide our lives. It contains the assurance of pardon, justification, sanctification, and redemption. In the end, the promise of a glorious resurrection and life eternal beyond the grave.

To him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us priests to our God, be honor and power everlasting.

SERMON, No. IX.

THEME.—THE TWO COVENANTS.

TEXT—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."—JER. xxxi: 31.

ALL who talk on the matters of the Bible at all use such terms as "first covenant" and "second covenant," "new covenant" and "old covenant," "new testament" and "old testament," "new institution" and "old institution," a "better covenant;" which last implies one not so good. In the use of those terms, we have Moses on one side and Jesus on the other; the law on the one hand and the Gospel on the other; the letter on the one hand and the spirit on the other. We can not talk on the matters of the Bible without the use of these terms. The ideas contained in these terms run through the entire revelation from God to man, and, whether men understand them or not, they are continually using the terms. Why the King James translators have given us the word "covenant" in the eighth chapter of Hebrews, and "testament" in the ninth chapter, is difficult to conceive, unless it was to darken counsel; for, in the original, we have the same word (*diatheke*) in both chapters, to express precisely the same thing, or used in the same sense. The mere English reader must see, as soon as the suggestion is made, the "covenant" of the eighth chapter is the same as the "testament" of the ninth. It is not a matter of serious

consequence whether you translate the original Greek word **diatheke** covenant or testament, but certainly it should be translated by the same word in both chapters, as the same thing is meant in both.

By these terms we have two institutions constantly brought to view—the old and the new. The old was by Moses and the new is by Jesus; hence, Moses represents the one and Jesus the other. The law sometimes stands for the one and the Gospel for the other; the letter, in some cases, stands for the one and the spirit for the other; the old covenant, in some cases, stands for the one and the new covenant for the other; the old testament, in some instances, stands for the one and the new testament for the other. No matter which of these representative terms is used, on either side, the same thing is meant. One is the old dispensation and the other the new; the old institution and the new—the former by Moses and the latter by Jesus. It then becomes a matter of transcendent importance to determine distinctly, all the time, what belongs to the old institution and what to the new; what belongs to the better covenant and what belongs to the inferior—to determine where the one terminates and the other begins. It is hoped that some of these things will be settled clearly and thoroughly in this discourse.

During the past hundred years the world has been furnished with some speculations touching the matters here introduced. It would be uncourteous to pass all these speculations in silence, therefore a respectful attention shall be given some of them. One of them starts out as follows: "God made a covenant with Abraham, and that covenant has been perpetuated to the present time, and is the Gospel covenant." The arguments to sustain this theory are styled "arguments to prove the identity of the covenant." What is meant by "identity of the covenant?" "Identity" is not similarity. Two things may be similar, but cannot be identical. To be identical, it must be the

same thing, not two things. It is, therefore, nonsense, to talk of the identity of the covenants, or the two covenants. There must be no two in the case, but the one identical same covenant, made with Abraham, perpetuated through the Mosaic and Christian institutions.

It would be well, before going further, to inquire into the importance of sustaining this theory of the identity of the covenant. What is to be gained by it? One replies that "there were infants in the Abrahamic covenant, and, if proved that the same covenant has been perpetuated to the present time, and is the Gospel covenant, infant church-membership is sustained." If that is the purpose, it would be well enough to look into the matter a little closely and see if it is right.

1. If the covenant made with Abraham is the Gospel covenant, then neither we nor our children are in it; and that is not the worst—we cannot get into it. Gen. xvii: 13, the Lord describes the only classes in that covenant. 1. "He that is born in thy house." 2. "He that is bought with thy money." We can not come in under either of those heads. We were not born in Abraham's house or family, and can not be, neither ourselves nor our children. We were not, neither we nor our children, bought with Abraham's money, and can not be. We can come in under neither of these heads. If this is the Gospel covenant, both ourselves and children are forever excluded from it. Do you reply that there were two covenants made with Abraham, and that the reference has been made to the wrong covenant? The covenant referred to is the one having infants in it, and, if you abandon that, you find no infants. It is the one to which you must go to find both infants and circumcision. Your dilemma is this: If you go to that covenant, you find that we are excluded by the description of the only two classes in it; that we were not

and our children were not born in Abraham's family, nor purchased with his money. If you abandon that covenant, you find no infants nor circumcision. In either case, you are completely defeated, and your argument ruined.

2. Jeremiah, standing thirteen hundred and fifty-one years this side of the time when the Lord made that covenant with Abraham, and, looking forward, says, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." Now, it is no matter how many covenants men talk of, nor what they call them—whether Adamic, Abrahamic, or Mosaic—before Jeremiah spoke, for he points forward to a covenant which the Lord says "I will make," and not to one which I have made, with Adam, Abraham, Moses, or any body else. But how do you know the prophet was speaking of the Gospel covenant? Because Paul quotes his language—Heb. viii: 8-13—and applies it to the Gospel, showing that the Gospel itself is that new covenant that the Lord said "I will make." Instead of this new covenant, the Gospel, which the Lord said "I will make," being the old covenant of circumcision, which he had made, the Lord most explicitly states that "it shall not be according to that old covenant." After a few minutes, it will be necessary to return to the language of Jeremiah again.

Another beautiful theory starts out as follows: "The Lord established a church in the time of Abraham, and that church has been perpetuated down through all generations and dispensations to the present time, and is now the Gospel Church, or Church of Christ." You inquire: Suppose all that is so; what of it? He replies: "There were infants in that church that God established in the time of Abraham, and if I can show that the same church has been perpetuated to the present time, and is now the Gospel

Church, then there are infants in it now." Arguments to prove this are styled arguments on the identity of the Church. What do you intend to do with this argument? says one. It must be shown that it is without the shadow of foundation. How can that be done? As follows:

1. There was no church established in the time of Abraham, nor was there any church in existence at that time. There was no church in the world at the time of Abraham, and there had been none from the beginning of time. There need be no angry feeling nor disputing about what is here said. The statements just made are in regard to a plain matter of fact. It depends on no speculation. If there was any church —Adamic, Abrahamic, Mosaic, or any other—in the time of Abraham, turn to the account of it and read it. There is not one word about any church in the world during the first twenty-five hundred years. The only worship in the world was family worship. The head of the family was the prophet, priest, and ruler. It is outside of the range of all reason and argument to permit men to *assume* that there was a church in the time of Abraham, and then *assume* that there were infants in it, and then *assume* that the Church then and now is the same Church, and, on those three *assumptions* to found a positive divine institution. You may then dismiss from your mind all idea of any Abrahamic church, with or without infants in it, and give yourself no more trouble about its identity with the Church of God now. Find an account of any church at all in the time of Abraham before you trouble yourself about its identity or similarity with any thing. The nation of Israel in the wilderness—Acts vii: 38—is called "the church in the wilderness," in the common version, but by the Bible union, "the *congregation* in the wilderness." This congregation in the wilderness certainly is not *identical* with the Church now, nor *similar*.

2. The Lord said, after he had entered on his public ministry—Matt. xvi: 18—"On this rock I will build my church." Notice, he does not say *have* built, but *will* build. This does not refer to an event past, but future. It does not refer to a church built in the time of Adam, Abraham, or Moses, or to one built any time before the Lord came into the world, but to one which the Lord said "I *will* build." As certain as this language is true, the church, or community, established by the Savior was not built or established when the Lord uttered the words "I *will* build my church."

3. Paul says—Eph. ii: 14–18—"For he is our peace, who made both one, and broke down the middle wall of partition; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, that he might make the two one new man in himself, making peace; and might reconcile both to God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." What is the Lord represented as doing here? As making one—making one new man. The word "man" here is used figuratively. What does it stand for? For the body, community, or church which Christ established. Then, it will make sense to insert the word *church* instead of the word "man." What did the Lord then make of the two?—"one *new* church." It was not, then, the continuation of one *old* church, but the making of one *new* church. This ought to end all idea of the perpetuation of an *old* church, and turn our attention to the one *new* church, which the Lord said "I *will* build," and which he did build.

4. To whom did Peter preach his first discourse after the Holy Spirit came on him and his fellow-apostles, to guide them into all truth? Certainly, to members of the old church, or Jews. They were all in the old, or the Jewish church, before he preached a word. What became of them after they heard Peter and gave themselves to Christ?

The history says, "There were, the same day, about three thousand added to them." Added to whom? To the same old church to which they already belonged? By no means; but to the apostles and the one hundred and twenty brethren—the "one new man," or church, which the Lord said "I will build," and which he founded on the day of Pentecost These were in the old church before they heard one word from Peter; were taken out of it and added to them —the apostles and brethren, or the new church.

But now attention must be given more minutely to the language of the prophet, Jer. xxxi: 31. He not only says, for the Lord, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah," but adds, "It shall not be according to the covenant that I made with their fathers." If it shall not be according to the covenant made with their fathers, wherein shall it differ from it? He proceeds, "They shall not," under the new covenant, "teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord." You inquire, why they shall not teach, saying, Know the Lord? The reason is, that under the new covenant, they shall all know the Lord. He will write his law on their hearts, in their inward parts, or in their minds, and *they shall all* know him from the least to the greatest. It is a condition on which they shall enter the new covenant, that they shall know the Lord. They can not enter the new covenant without knowing the Lord. In Christ, they "are all the children of God by faith." There can not be one in the new covenant without faith. This brings us to the grand and distinguishing difference between the old covenant and the new. The basis of admission is different Under the old covenant, the ground of membership was in a birth of flesh, or a purchase with money. The covenant included the two classes: 1. "He that is born in thy house." 2. "He that is bought with thy money." This included unconscious

infants, who did not know the Lord, and who had to be taught, saying, "Know the Lord." The ignorant heathen servant, bought with money, was in the covenant by virtue of a purchase with money without knowing the Lord, and they were required to teach him to know the Lord. Under this covenant there were these two grounds of membership, or grounds of which they were in the covenant, without knowing the Lord. In the one case, they were in the covenant on the fleshly basis, or the ground of a blood relation, or a fleshly birthright, the same as gives a man an interest in his father's estate in our country. In the other, the money basis, or a purchase with money. In neither of these cases did faith have any thing to do in the matter. They were not in the covenant on the ground of faith, any change in heart or life, of being "a new creature," or "born again."

Under the new covenant, the best covenant, founded on better promises, they are not in it by virtue of the first, or natural birth, but being born again; not on the ground of being born of parents in the Church, but born of God; not on the ground of a fleshly or blood relation to man, but a spiritual relation to God; not in the covenant in ignorance of God, so as to have to be taught to know the Lord, but by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. They do not have to be taught, in the new covenant, to know the Lord, because they can not enter it without knowing him. No man comes into this new covenant by being born in Abraham's family, nor by being purchased with his money, nor by being born in any other man's family, or purchased with his money; but by being *born again*, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but by the will of God; not of corruptible seed, but the incorruptible seed, the Word of God, that lives and abides forever. No matter, under the new covenant, what blood a man has in his veins, nor to

what nation he belongs. That is all nothing. The warning now is, "Say not we have Abraham for our father." "We have no confidence in the flesh." "If any man is in Christ, he is *a new creature*." Circumcision avails nothing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

This introduces us to the most degrading, corrupting, and damaging error that ever took effect on the interests of the kingdom of God—the error of retrograding to the old fleshly basis of membership, and making flesh and not spirit the ground of membership in the Church. This was the precise thing that came up in the conversation between the Savior and Nicodemus. The Savior knew that Nicodemus was standing on fleshly birth, his blood relation to Abraham, and swept all that away by informing him, that "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." This astonished the rabbi, and he instantly inquired, "How can these things be?" The Lord explained to him, that "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," and further on, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." "Wonder not," said he, "that I said you must be born again." If this teaching of our Lord were fully unfolded, how many thousands of honest souls, who have been misled and made to believe they were in the covenant, or in the Church, who are not, would never rest till they would, by faith, enter into Christ, or, which is the same, into his body, the Church?

Nine-tenths of all the Church members in the world, if the language of the Savior with Nicodemus were carried out, in the true meaning and spirit of it, would find that they are not in the body of Christ, the Church. They would find that they have been misled—deceived—and that they are not in Christ. Lift up your eyes and survey the field. The Pope claims two hundred millions of human beings under his dominion, or about one-sixth of the population of the globe.

There are now about three millions and a half of these, or something near one person in eleven of the whole population, in the United States, all claimed as members of the Church. On what grounds are all these claimed as members of the Church? On the ground of faith? of any divine change in heart or life? any personal holiness or piety? No; nothing of this kind. Any knowledge of God? By no means, for they were, at least nine-tenths of them, in the Church before they knew there was a God or Savior. Suppose Archbishop Purcell were to step up before us, and you would inquire of him, Are you a member of the Church? Certainly, he would reply, and not simply a member, but a member of the only true Church. How do you suppose he became a member? A gentleman probably would respond: "I suppose, sir, that he read the doctrines of Holy Mother Church, and became convinced that she was the true Church, and joined." At first thought, it appears very reasonable that such should have been the case, but the truth is far otherwise. He never joined "Holy Mother Church," as you call it, nor any other church. He was in the Romish Church before he knew his right hand from his left; before he knew there was a God, a Savior, or a Church; not by "being born *again*," but by his birth of the flesh, or by virtue of his mother being in the Church when he was born.

Some one thinks this is true of Romanists, but not of others. But let us look; the Greek Church is put down in the Cyclopedia Americana at sixty-six millions. On what basis is the membership of all these? The same as the Romanists. Their membership is founded in a blood relation, and they are in the Church before they have any faith or knowledge of God. Regeneration is not known among them. There are about seven millions of Jews in the world, all members on the fleshly basis, and in the Church by virtue of a blood relation. What shall be said more? Look at that civil,

moral, quiet, and peaceable Friend, or Quaker, with his broad-brimmed hat, his round-breasted and drab-colored coat, as he sedately walks in, and inquire of him, whether he is a member of the Church. He answers, Certainly. You inquire when and where he joined the Church. He explains to you that he never joined the Church at all! A member of the Church, and never joined! How can that be? How would he show that he is a member of the Church if he never joined? Show it from the Bible! Do you inquire, what part of the Bible? The answer is, from the leaves containing the family record, showing that his mother was a member when he was born, and consequently he has a birthright. His membership has nothing to do with faith, the influence of the Spirit, the knowledge of God, his own volition or action, but was secured by a birth of the flesh. Yet he talks about "the light within" and the "teaching of the Spirit," but nothing of this kind had any thing to do with making him a member of the Church.

No doubt many professional and scientific men have looked on preachers as a very stupid class, disputing about sprinkling a little water on the face of an infant, and they have turned to their pursuits, thinking the question one of no consequence. But they misapprehend the question. It is not one about sprinkling water on the face of an infant or any body else, much water, or little water, that we are discussing. The inquiry is about making a member of the Church without faith, without the knowledge of God, a single divine impression on the heart, any influence of the Spirit of God, the person's own heart or conscience having any thing to do with it. Here is where the controversy lies. The ground here maintained is, that no human being can be a member of the body of Christ without faith, a change in heart and life—the heart, conscience, and volition being involved in the matter.

An English lady, once a school teacher, heard a discourse that roused her considerably, and, in the private circle, introduced the subject of "infant baptism," as she styled it. The preacher told her that there was a matter lying back of that of much more importance to her. She inquired what it was. He told her that some people insisted that no religious rite, ordinance, or act, could be of any value unless the heart was in it, and inquired how she looked on that matter. She said she insisted the same herself. He inquired what was meant by the terms professors and non-professors of religion. She replied, illustrating by the profession of law, medicine, and teaching. He then said: "Madam, did you ever, for yourself, from your own heart and with your own lips, make a profession of the religion of Christ?" She replied: "My dear mother consecrated me to the Lord when I was a little child." The preacher continued: "I presume your mother was a good woman and did many good things; but I am inquiring into what *you have done yourself.* The apostle says: 'To whom *you yield yourselves* servants to obey, his servants you are.' Did you ever from your own heart make a profession yourself, or yield yourself to God?" Under much excitement she rose and left the room. After hearing a few more discourses, she came forward, stood up before her God and Savior, and from her own heart and with her own mouth, confessed the Savior of the world, and *yielded herself* to be a servant of God.

After all the ado we have had about heart-work, heart-religion, doing from the heart, etc., the strongest charge lying against the popular religion of our times is that there is not enough heart and faith in it. The *heart-work* is the very thing that is lacking. The idea of making a member of the Church, not only without the "heart-work," so called, but without faith, a single spiritual impression, religious

idea, or even knowledge of the existence of God, or even the exercise of human volition, is one of the most preposterous and absurd things in the records of history. Take another illustration of the principle involved. A preacher was once on a train of cars and soon saw that the two gentlemen sitting just in front of him were both preachers; that they resided in the same city and were rather intimate acquaintances with each other; that one was a Methodist and the other a Presbyterian. As the train glided on, they engaged in conversation, sometimes bordering on argument, touching the comparative merits of their respective churches. After many pleasant hits had been made, the Methodist preacher said to the Presbyterian, "We have the advantage of you in our church." "In what?" inquired the other. "We give all their choice in baptism; if they require immersion, we immerse; if they prefer sprinkling, we sprinkle, or pouring, we pour." The other appeared perplexed with this. There was a show of liberality in it that the other did not know how to offset. The Methodist preacher seemed to triumph, in this liberty in his church, of all having their "choice of modes." After talking loud and in a somewhat exultant manner for some moments, he turned to the preacher sitting back of him, knowing nothing as to who he was, and, seeing that he was listening to the conversation, said, "Stranger, do you not think I have the better of the argument?" "What church do you represent?" said the strange preacher. "The Methodist Episcopal Church," said he. "Did you say you give all their *choice* between sprinkling, pouring, and immersion?" "I did," said he. "I believe you baptize infants sometimes," said the stranger. "I do," said he. "What becomes of the *choice* of an infant when you baptize it?" inquired the stranger. He did not tell. It has no choice, not only between sprinkling, pouring, and immersion, but it has no

choice between Romanists and Protestants, any more than the types that shall print these words have, whether they will print these or some other words; no more choice than the brick in your house, whether they would go into it, or into some other house.

Some years since, when that mysterious political organization, styled "Know-Nothings," was in full blast in this country, they stated in their publications, that Romish girls, hired as servants in Protestant families, would fall in love with the good lady's little infant, and when the mother would be out, steal off with it to a priest, to sprinkle water on it, in the name of the Trinity, and thus make a Roman Catholic of it. This was rung in the ears of the archbishop in Cincinnati for weeks. By Protestants it was regarded as a most cruel thing, to take a little infant child and allow a priest to bind its soul down in a system of religion before it could have any choice or knowledge in the matter, or even know good or evil. Nor did any one ever think the thing any worse than it was. The transaction, on the part of the priest, was the most insidious, unmanly, and covert of all transactions. The idea of a priest, who can't prove his doctrine, and is afraid to try it, through the assistance of an innocent, but deluded girl, as he goes through society, seeking and obtaining the opportunity to bind down the soul of an unconscious infant and performing the act, is certainly disgusting to an American citizen of intelligence! What wonderful learning and talent it must require to proselyte an infant child, without a spiritual impulse or idea of the will of God to man.

But how much worse is it for a Romish girl, who believes it will be lost if it is not in the Romish Church, to do this, than for the Protestant mother to take it to her preacher and have him bind its soul down in a system before she knows whether it will believe in that system, in God or the Savior?

What becomes of all freedom, on the part of the child, volition, private judgment, and even conscience? What becomes of faith, repentance, confession, volition? All these are swept away, and a scheme of making members of infants, without faith, a change of heart, any knowledge of God or the Savior is adopted! This is a grand scheme for a class of men not able to advocate their religious system, by argument, reason, and Scripture before intelligent men and women. These little folks can make no resistance. They can be made Mohammedans as easily as any thing, if the mother is so disposed. How different all this from the Gospel, preached by the holy apostles, which appeals to the judgment, the heart, and consciences of men and women, convincing them that Jesus is the Lord, and teaches them that to whomsoever they *yield themselves* servants to obey, his servants they are. The infant *yields not itself*, but is bound down by the *consent* of the mother and the *act* of the priest before it can *yield itself* to any thing.

"Then," says a man, "you have no salvation for infants."

Is that so? Do you believe they will be lost, if they are not in the Church? "No," you say. Then, if you can find infant salvation without their being in the Church, why may not others find the same salvation for them? But what do you give them more than those who do not take them into the Church? You give them no Gospel, knowing that they can not understand or receive it. They give them none. So far you and they are even. You give them no faith and they give them none. Here you and they are even again. You give them no repentance and they give them none. This brings you out even again. You do not believe the infant will be lost if it is not in the Church, and they do not. Here you agree again. What, then, do you give the infant which they do not? Nothing under the sun, only a few drops of water on its face. If you, then, have salvation

for it and we have not, it is *water salvation* and precious little of the water at that.

"What, then, will *you* do with infants?" says a man. Nothing, till they can know the Lord. Till they can believe, nothing can be done for them, nor do they need any thing. Till they can know the Lord and believe, they are not subjects of religion, not accountable. They need no faith, repentance, confession, nor membership in the Church. They need no Church. They have no *personal* or *actual* sin. Hence Jesus said of them, "Of such is the kingdom of God," and to persons of the years of accountability, he said, "Except you repent and become as little children, you can not enter into the kingdom of God." This shows that he did not style them little *sinners*, needing baptism or church-membership to save them, but as needing nothing, only what any saint needs, a resurrection from the dead and glorification to prepare them for heaven.

No one need begin now to think or talk of children growing up in heathenism. Nothing of that sort is here encouraged, but the farthest possible from it. All here said is in reference to children in infancy, or before they can be taught any thing. As soon as possible, teach them to know the Lord, to confide in him, or believe on him and love him. As soon as they are capable, teach them to *yield themselves* to his divine and glorious authority. Teach them the whole will of God as soon as you possibly can. This is not only right, but you are required to do it. This is a very different thing from binding them down by a vow placed on them before they can know any thing.

It is now seen that to hear, believe, repent, turn to God, and become a member of the Church, is a *personal thing. It is a personal act,* and *personal responsibility is involved in it.* This perfectly corresponds with the whole new institution.

But now one starts up from a new point, admitting all that

has gone before, and says, "I plant myself here: John the Immerser immersed the Savior in Jordan and, as he stood on the bank of the Jordan, the Holy Spirit came on him and consecrated him High Priest of the Christian profession. I, therefore, maintain, that he entered his priestly office immediately after his immersion." Are you sure of that? There are several things that you should settle before you thus decide:

1. Where have we an account of his acting as priest while on earth? Certainly, if he entered his priestly office during his personal ministry, his biographers have wholly omitted to mention it. Not one word have we in the book, either about his being consecrated priest immediately after his immersion, or even officiating as priest while on earth. This idea is without one scrap of authority in the book of God.

2. Paul says, Heb. viii: 4, "For if he were on earth he could not be a priest, seeing that there are already priests who offer gifts according to the law." He "entered not into the holy places made with hands, figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." See Heb. ix: 24. He never officiated on earth, as a priest, nor in the holy place on earth, but in the true holy place. When he was bleeding, suffering, and dying on the cross, he was not in the capacity nor performing the functions of a priest. He was then the bleeding, suffering, and dying victim. He was not after the order of Aaron, nor Levi; belonged not to the Aaronic nor the Levitical priesthood, but was a priest forever after the order of Milchisedec, who was without descent—that is, *lineal* descent, belonging to neither of the priestly lines in the old institution. He could not be a priest while these old priests were in authority. Their authority closed when Jesus died and nailed the handwriting of ordinances to the cross. This was the end of the law for righteousness. When the law of carnal commandments was

abolished, taken out of the way, and Jesus had ascended to heaven, the true holy place, and not with the blood of bulls and of goats, but with his own blood, as the Great High Priest of the Christian profession, he appeared in the presence of God for us, to purge us forever from our sins.

Under the law the high priests had to enter the holy places on earth with the blood of bulls and of goats, to offer for their own sins and also for the sins of the people. But these offerings could not take away sins, but only laid them over another year, when they were in the same manner brought up in remembrance. Thus all the sins, even of the saints, still remained and were brought into remembrance every year. But when Christ, with the better sacrifice—the sacrifice of himself and his own blood—appeared in heaven, the true holy place, once for all, he purged us forever from our sins. There will be no more annual remembrance of sins and no more sin-offerings. He is the end of sin-offering. Our sins and iniquities will be brought into remembrance, in the holy places on earth, by the high priests, no more forever. Jesus, with his one offering, has purged us forever from our old sins. As our high priest, he can now be touched with the feeling of our infirmity, and we can therefore come boldly to the throne of grace and obtain help in every time of need.

In this better covenant, on better promises, we have none, who entered in infancy, without knowing the Lord, nor any who were brought into the covenant by a purchase with money, without knowing the Lord, who have to be taught saying, "Know the Lord," but all in the covenant are there by faith, by knowing the Lord, and their own *voluntary act.* By their own sin-offering their sins have been purged forever, and there is no more remembrance of their sins. They can now offer the daily sacrifice, the fruit of their lips, as the true worshipers, who worship in spirit and in truth. Their religion is not founded in flesh and blood. It is no matter what nation,

kindred, or tongue they are of. The matter now is a *new creature*—not to be born of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the will of God.

This new covenant, or testament, was to be written on the heart, in the mind, in their inward parts, and, of course, they would all know him from the least to the greatest. How was this writing to be made? How was the law to be written on their hearts or in their minds? There are two ways of ascertaining how this was to be done: 1. By ascertaining the meaning of this figurative language, and applying it. 2. By going to where the Lord actually put his law into their minds, and learning how he did it. What, then, is the meaning of this figurative language? *Literally*, there is no writing on the heart or in the mind. The real import is, that it should be put into their minds or understandings. This is represented by the figure of writing. In this figure, the Lord is the writer. He says "I will write." The heart answers to the paper, or it is that on which the writing is made. "I will write it on their hearts." The apostles had an instrumentality in it, for Paul says, speaking of this writing, "It was ministered by us"—the apostles. They occupied the place of the pen. But this writing was not with *ink*, but by "the Spirit of the living God." The Spirit, then, answers to the ink in this figure.

When the appointed time had come, for the law of "the Lord to go forth from Jerusalem," and all things were ready for the Lord to commence writing, as in all cases of writing, the first thing was to fill the pen with ink. The apostles answered to the pen, and he filled them with the Holy Spirit, which answered to the ink. Through the apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit, God spoke the law. When the people heard it "they were cut to the heart."

But, laying aside all figures, how did the Lord put his law, the new covenant, into the minds of the people? The

answer is, that the Gospel was preached by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, which things the angels desired to look into. This was in accordance with the divine arrangement, for the Lord commissioned the apostles to "Go, disciple all nations"—to "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Paul was sent to the people, and to the Gentiles, to "turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." "To me," says Paul, "is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which in other ages was hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." See Eph. i: 10. The Lord says, in his last public address to his Father, "The words which thou gavest me I have given them, and they have kept thy word." These words contained the law of the Lord. The Father gave them to our Lord, the Messiah, and he gave them to the apostles. The Lord then prays for them who should believe on him, *through their word.*

How, then, did he put his law into the minds of the people? He gave it to his Son, the Mediator of the new covenant. He gave it to the holy apostles, whom he had chosen as his embassadors. They were then filled with the Holy Spirit to bring all things to their remembrance, and preached this law of the Lord. The people heard it, and were cut to the heart, and cried out, "What shall we do?" This is the manner in which he put his law into their minds —wrote it on their hearts. Here, now, are persons inquiring at the door of the kingdom for admission. They want the door opened to them. Here is the man with the keys of the kingdom, ready to open the door, indorsed by the statement of the King: "Whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Whatever terms of ad-

mittance into the kingdom, or of remission of sins, he shall make known in opening the door or answering the question, "What shall we do?" will be ratified or bound in heaven. The terms of entrance into the kingdom, or of pardon, set forth by Peter, on Pentecost, were *bound* or ratified in heaven, and the persons released from their sins, in accordance with these terms, are really released, and those not released in accordance with these terms are really not released at all. The setting forth of these terms of pardon, or admittance into the kingdom of God, and thus opening the way to inquiring persons, was using the keys of the kingdom—unlocking the door. These terms are now incorporated in the new covenant, or the law of the Lord, and written on the hearts of all in the covenant. No man has any thing to do now, in displaying his charity, by any modification of terms of the covenant. The true man of God does not tamper with the terms of induction. He is neither charitable nor uncharitable in the case. He is in no way responsible for the terms of the covenant. His work is honestly to present them as he finds them, giving assurance that the new covenant, with the terms of induction into the kingdom, or, which is the same, the terms of pardon, and every thing else in it, is sanctioned by the "two immutable things"—the *promise and the oath of God.* This covenant, or the law of the Lord, is the immutable counsel of his will. Men may rely on its terms of pardon for the alien who would turn to God, and for the disciple of Jesus who is overtaken in a fault, with the fullest and most unshaken confidence.

This covenant is the *last will* and *testament*—the *last,* the *final* effort, so to speak—of our most gracious and merciful God, to reclaim and bring back an apostate and sinful race. It contains the infinite goodness and love. It is confirmed by the predictions of all the holy prophets, the testimony of all the apostles, and the Lord himself, surrounded by the

most sublime displays of supernatural power, backed up by the greatest purity of both teaching and practice. It comes clothed with all authority in heaven and earth, backed up by the oath of God, the crown and the throne in heaven. This covenant is sealed by the blood of Jesus and signed by the great name of Jehovah. It offers a free and plenary pardon to all offenders on simple and easy terms. It offers the richest rewards to all its subjects—the grandest inheritance ever proposed to erring mortals—a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens—a home in the eternal city, the New Jerusalem—eternal bliss and happiness. This is his last offer, his last invitation to man. The time will soon be out. The door will soon be closed. The language will soon be applicable, "He that is holy, let him be holy still," "he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." This will be the end of all invitation, of all turning to God, of all reformation.

On the other hand, the threatenings against the persistently impenitent are of the most fearful, terrible, and awful character. Human speech can utter nothing more fearful than "the fire that shall never be quenched," where "their worm dies not," "the lake of fire," "tormented day and night forever and ever," "everlasting punishment," "weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth." The punishment represented by such terms as these is the last resort with the incorrigible, the determined, and obstinate opponents of God and righteousness. In reference to them, God has sworn that to Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess, for he must reign till he puts all enemies under his feet.

It is now an "acceptable time and a day of salvation." "To-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the bitter provocation." The Lord "is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

Do you reply, sinner, that you "belong to the big church"—that "if you are lost, you will have plenty of company?" So did the masses, in the time of Noah, belong to the "big church." Noah did not belong to the "big church." The "big church" was destroyed. Noah and his family were saved. Lot did not belong to the "big church." He was saved and the "big church" was destroyed.

"If your doctrine is true, there will be but few saved." That may be. You might have said that to Noah and to Lot, and your words would have proved true. There were but few saved. In human governments, if a large number are condemned, the heart of man would fail to execute them. In the divine government the *condemned* will be punished, no matter whether *many* or *few*. The Lord is able to bring the *guilty* to punishment, and *justice* demands it. If all are found guilty, then all will be punished.

"But there is time enough yet." Where have you obtained any revelation in reference to the time you have got? You have no revelation in reference to it at all. You may be in the very last day of your time, now giving attention to the last exhortation, in the last sermon, concerning the last will of God to man, you will ever hear. Every one either has heard, or will hear, the last discourse some time. You know not, then, that this is not the last discourse, and this the last exhortation you will ever hear. Tamper not, trifle not, and be not indifferent, but hear the entreaties of those who love you, and the Lord who died for you. Turn away from the world, from your sins and follies, and come to him who is "the way, the truth, and the life," and be made unspeakably happy now and prepared for eternal happiness in the world to come.

SERMON, No. X.

THEME.—THE INAUGURATION OF THE NEW INSTITUTION.

TEXT—"Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning in Jerusalem."—LUKE xxiv: 46, 47.

THIS Scripture is selected with the intention of discoursing on the beginning of repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ among all nations, or what is the same, the beginning of the reign of Christ, or the inauguration of the new institution. There was a grand change when the law ended and the Gospel commenced; when the Mosaic dispensation terminated and the Christian was introduced; when the work of the mediator of the first covenant closed, and the work of the mediator of the second covenant had culminated in an established institution, fully and completely set in operation. Some have become weary of discussing such themes, call them "first principles," and say "we must go on to perfection." But there is reason to question the soundness of any man who talks of "leaving the first principles." The child may learn the English alphabet by the time it is four years of age, but it will never advance so far in literature as to have no use for that alphabet; or it may learn figures by the same period in life, but will never go on to such perfection as not to have use

for these numerals. So the faith that first moved the heart of the sinner to turn to the Lord, then comforted the heart of the saint, will be his support when dying. He will never leave faith, unless he apostatizes from the Lord. In the same way, we can never leave any thing that is truly a principle of the Gospel, but must hold on to the first, middle, and last principles till we die.

Not only so, but there is a rising generation constantly coming on, that have never heard nor understood the first principles of the Gospel, who must be taught from the starting-point, and the principles shown up to them. For the want of this, in many instances, where churches have stood for a long time, and people have grown up without much religious instruction, they have, by personal influence and some warm and affectionate appeals, been brought into the Church not knowing the first principles or any other principles of the Gospel, and without having any love of the truth, or even knowing what it is. There are but few who understand the first principles who do not know all the principles; but it is hard to find one who, knows not the first principles well, *does not love them;* who knows or loves any of the principles of the Gospel, or respects, adores, or honors him who gave them. But to the subject in hand.

He who devotes himself to the disastrous work of perverting men, delights in obscuring that which should be clear, in darkening counsel where there should be light, in throwing that into doubt where there should be the full assurance of faith. Hence the efforts to hide from the understandings of men the beginning of the reign of Christ. Such desire no man to have the clear light of the beginning and setting in operation the new Church, with the development of the clear and easy terms of reconciliation. This knowledge is fatal to his work of delusion and deception. One man perverts till he denies that there is any kingdom

even yet in existence, and leads others to think that the kingdom has not yet come. Another is busily engaged in maintaining that the kingdom was established in the time of John the Immerser. In one word, in all his machinations, he is satisfied with any way, not only in this matter, but every other, except *the right way*. The right way never suits him. Attention must now be given to these perversions.

1. Is the kingdom now in existence? Is Jesus now King? The main burden of the mission of John the Immerser was to announce that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This, too, was a main item in the preaching of the apostles under the first commission, as also of the seventy. Could it have been proper for them to have preached that the kingdom is at hand, when its establishment was eighteen hundred years off? During this same period he taught them to pray, "Thy kingdom come." The Lord said to them, "Fear not, little flock; it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." "There be some of them standing here who shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." See Mark ix: 1, and Luke ix: 27. Some seek a fulfillment of this in the transfiguration, but the kingdom of heaven did not there "come with power," nor in any other way. To say the most of it, that was no more than a representation of the king in his state of glory, as he now appears in heaven, and not even a *representation* of the kingdom. He unquestionably intended them to understand that, while some of them were yet living, they should see the kingdom come with power. They preached, then, that the kingdom was at hand, prayed for it to come, and had the promise that some of them should see it come with power before they should taste death. This all points to the establishment of the kingdom at an early period.

After the ascension of the Savior, we find not an intima-

tion of any man praying "Thy kingdom come," nor any divine teacher enjoining any such prayer. They continued to preach that "the kingdom is at hand," and to pray for it to come till it did come—till they saw it come with power, but never preached or prayed so from that time forward.

That the Church and kingdom mean the same, see the following: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." See Matt. xvi: 18, 19. What is the Lord's theme here? Certainly the foundation of the Church, the rock on which Christ will build his Church. "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," and to you "will I give the keys of the kingdom." Has he changed to another theme? or is not what he calls "my Church" the same as "the kingdom of heaven?" The Church here is unquestionably the same as the kingdom. "Keys," here, symbolize the power to open the Church or kingdom, or, which is the same thing, the terms of pardon; the terms of pardon being the same as the terms of induction into the kingdom. Where was Peter to use these keys? "Whatever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Where is he who has the keys of the kingdom of heaven to do this binding and loosing? "Whatever you shall bind *on earth*" —"whatever you shall loose *on earth*." It is to be done on earth. How is Peter to use the keys of the kingdom, in binding and loosing, or opening and shutting, *on earth*, if the kingdom itself, the door of which he is to open, is not *on earth?* No man who denies the existence of the kingdom "on earth," in the time of Peter, can tell how this could have been done. But the truth is, the kingdom is the

Church, and the keys, the power conferred on Peter by the great Head of the Church, to open the way into the Church, or kingdom, which he did by laying down the terms of salvation.

These things being so, we have the following clear statements in reference to an existing kingdom after Peter had used the keys. Col. i: 13, Paul says of the disciples, that they "had been delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son." Could they have been translated into a kingdom that was not in existence? The kingdom had come, as the Lord promised, and in answer to the prayer "Thy kingdom come; thy will be done *on earth*," and was in existence, and the saints at Colossee were in the kingdom of God's dear Son. In Paul's letter to the Hebrews, xii: 22–28, he speaks of "the church of the first-born" and the "kingdom" as the same, not as something in the future; but says, "You *have come* to Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven;" and further on, he adds: "Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably." 1 Thess. ii: 13, Paul said to the saints, "God has called you into his kingdom and glory." Rev. i: 9, John speaks of the seven churches in Asia as "his companions in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." This is enough to show that the kingdom was in existence in the time of the apostles, and the saints had been "called into it," "received it," been "translated into it," and were actually "in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ." This must suffice for those who deny the existence of any kingdom on earth at the present.

2. Did the kingdom come in the life-time of the Savior? Was the Gospel fully preached and were any introduced into

the kingdom during that period? In these questions will be found the main theme for the present discourse. Several things must be clearly observed here:

1. When the kingdom was founded, the keys of the kingdom were used, the door opened, the Gospel fully preached, and persons introduced into the kingdom.

2. No person can learn the way into the kingdom without hearing the Gospel preached, not in promise, nor in prophecy, but in its completeness as a full revelation.

3. What, then, is the Gospel? "All the preachers claim to preach the Gospel, and how am I to tell which is the Gospel?"

There must, then, be some method by which we may identify the Gospel, or, at least, we must have some marks without which we can not have the Gospel fully preached. The Bible is not a book of definitions, but it defines some things, and among these the Gospel. 1 Cor. xv: 3, 4, Paul says, "For I delivered to you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." This passage develops three things, without which we can not have the the Gospel in its full development. 1. It must be preached that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. 2. That he was buried. 3. That he rose from the dead according to the Scriptures. Whatever may be required more, these central and fundamental items must exist in the Gospel. Any thing claiming to be the Gospel without these items, would be utterly empty. To these items, two more must be added. That Jesus shed his blood for many for the remission of sins, must as certainly be found in it as that the Lord Jesus is divine. The office and work of the Holy Spirit must also be set forth in the Gospel. Any system without the death of Christ, his burial, resurrection, his

blood, with the office and work of the Holy Spirit, would not be received by any intelligent people. To this, all worthy of any note will agree.

The way is now clear to look for the Gospel and see if we can find where it was fully preached first. It will be simpler and easier to divide off into periods. Take, then, the entire period from Adam to John the Immerser, and inquire which one of the holy men, the ancient seers, or men whom God authorized to speak to man, ever preached that Jesus died for our sins according to the Scriptures? The answer certainly is, none of them. Which one of these holy men preached that the Lord was buried? Not a man of them. Which one of them ever preached that he rose from the dead according to the Scriptures? Not a single man of them. Which one of them ever preached that the Lord shed his blood for many for the remission of sins? Not a man during the entire period to which reference is here made. Which one of them ever set forth the office and work of the Holy Spirit? None of them. No matter how good the men, how strong their faith, nor how pious, these were not their themes. These great fundamental and central matters of the kingdom, filling such a large space in the apostles' preaching, had no place in their teaching. These were matters but dimly shadowed forth in their predictions and not understood by any man of that entire period. How, then, let it be inquired, did they preach the Gospel without preaching that Jesus died, was buried, rose again, shed his blood, or even setting forth the office and work of the Holy Spirit? The answer is simply that they never preached the Gospel of Christ in all its fullness or completeness.

Some one says, "I grant that the Gospel was not preached in its completeness and fullness during the period just specified. But my ground is this: John the Immerser was the first great Gospel preacher. He founded the Church, opened

the door, preached the Gospel in all its fullness, and introduced the first persons into the kingdom." Are you sure of that? In what part of John's preaching did he preach that the Lord died for our sins according to the Scriptures? Most assuredly he never preached it at all, for he preached his last sermon and died himself before the Lord died. He certainly never preached that Jesus died before he did die. Nor did he ever preach that the Lord was buried before he was buried. The preaching of John was all over before the Lord was buried. His preaching was all done before the Lord was risen, and he unquestionably never preached that the Lord was risen before he was risen. The same is true in regard to the shedding of his blood. John had preached the last sermon, and his own blood was shed before the Lord shed his blood. He certainly did not preach that Jesus shed his blood before he did shed it. These were not the themes on which John dwelt, nor the themes which the Lord put into his mouth. The Lord was not ready for these themes yet.

The inquiry now comes up touching the meaning of preaching the Gospel "in its fullness or completeness." This must now be explained. "The Gospel was preached to Abraham;" and, again, "the Gospel was preached to them as well as to us." "What is the meaning of all this," says a man, "if the Gospel was not preached before John the Immerser, nor by him?" The Gospel was preached before John, and "the Gospel of the kingdom" by him, but not in a complete revelation, or it was only in a mystery. This must now be explained.

1. There is something in the Scriptures called "the eternal purpose" of God. This "eternal purpose" was in the fullness of time to send the Savior, publish the Gospel, establish the Church, and unite the Jews and Gentiles in "one body." This purpose contained Christ, the Gospel, and all

things pertaining to the new institution, in a mystery, or a secret. It contained the Gospel, "hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ." No human being knew any thing about it.

2. We then have something called "the promise." What promise? The promise that God made to Abraham. See Gen. xxii: also, Gal. iii: 8. That which was contained in the purpose of God is now embodied in a promise—the promise of God to Abraham. This promise contains Christ, the Gospel, the Church—the entire new institution. It is all couched in the few brief words: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Still no man understood what was contained in this promise. It was the Gospel *in promise.*

3. Then comes the prophecies. The same that existed in the purpose of God, and then in the promise, is next found embodied in prophecy—it is the Gospel in prophecy.

4. Then came John the Immerser, the twelve apostles, the Savior, and seventy others, preaching the good news of the kingdom—that the kingdom is at hand—the kingdom approaches. This was the Gospel and the kingdom in a preparatory or an incipient state, or not fully developed and unfolded.

5. When Jesus had died, been buried, shed his blood, risen, and ascended into heaven; when he sent the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth, under the last commission, they made a full revelation of that which had previously existed in a mystery in the different forms just described.

To illustrate what is here meant, suppose some man in your community conceives the idea of building a great factory, and, after maturing it for a time purposes to do it. There is now a factory in *purpose,* but not in fact, neither running nor doing work. Nor does any man know any thing of it

except the man who has it in his purpose, nor has it any existence anywhere except in his *purpose*. It is all a secret. After a time, in a conversation with some prominent men in the community, he embodies his purpose in a promise to build a factory. There is yet no factory in existence, except in purpose and promise. The promise being known in the community, excites some interest and sets inquiry in motion. He now advances another step and makes sundry predictions in reference to the factory, touching the time when it will be completed, the amount of work it will do, the advantage it will be to the community, etc. The factory still has no existence only in purpose, promise, and prophecy. The next thing you hear is that the ground has been broken, the foundation laid, materials brought together, machinery purchased, etc. It is now a factory in a preparatory or an incipient state, but not complete nor doing any work. But finally it is finished and set in motion; the looms clatter, the spindles hum; it is now complete and doing work. It was a factory first in purpose, then in promise, then in prophecy, then in a preparatory or incipient state, then in fact, in actual existence, complete in all its parts, doing work. So the Gospel and kingdom of God first existed only in the purpose of God, then in the promise to Abraham, then in the prophecies of the Old Testament, then in the preparatory or incipient state, and finally in a state of completeness and perfection, in full operation on Pentecost.

But now one more period must be considered. Some man will say, "I will go to the apostles during the life-time of the Savior, while they were bosom companions with him and receiving daily lessons of instruction from his lips. They then understood all about the Gospel and kingdom, and set out these matters rightly." A very brief consideration of the matter will show that you are greatly mistaken in that. During the Lord's personal ministry the apostles neither

understood the Gospel nor the kingdom. There is nothing clearer than that they did not understand their Master and Leader during this period. They had their minds in one direction and the Lord had his in another. The matter worked according to his mind and not according to theirs. They found their views full of mistakes and blunders, and his without a single mistake. You never find him disappointed. But take a few examples:

If any one thinks the apostles preached the Gospel fully, during the life-time of the Savior, such an one should consult Matt. xvi: 20, "Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ." How could they preach the Gospel fully without telling any man that "Jesus is the Christ?" This is the very first thing to tell in preaching the Gospel fully, and the very first thing they did tell after commencing under the last commission. This restriction had to be taken off before they could preach the Gospel fully.

Again, Matt. xvi: 21, the Lord said to the disciples, "That he must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." How did Peter take this? "Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord, this shall not be to thee." Was Peter all right in this? Certainly not; hence, the Lord said, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense to me, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." What did Peter mean? He had his heart on an earthly kingdom and an earthly king, and he did not believe that his king would be put to death, nor intend to permit it. He intended to encourage his Master with assurances that he would stand by him. If a man doubts the correctness of this, he can turn to Matt. xxvi, and read the account of the matter. True to his purpose, he "drew a sword and struck a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear." This little comment

shows what he meant. He did not believe at this time that Jesus would die, and intended to fight to defend him, still believing that he would be an earthly king. The Lord told him to "put up the sword again, for all those who take the sword shall perish with the sword."

Again, "Peter said to him, though all men shall be offended because of thee, I never will be offended." The Lord replied, "Verily, I say to thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. Peter said to him, though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise said also all the disciples." See Matt. xxvi. How did the matter turn out? While the Lord was on trial, and needed a friend more than he had ever done before, Peter sat "without the palace, and a damsel came to him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. But he denied before them all, saying, I know not what thou sayest." Presently, the matter was pressed on him, one saying, "This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth." This "he denied with an oath," declaring, "I do not know the man." The third time the matter was pressed on him, saying, "Surely thou art also one of them, for thy speech betrayeth thee. Then he began to curse and swear, saying, I know not the man." See Matt. xxvi: 69–75. Surely no man's attainments in divine things are to be envied who can not see that this was a preparatory period; that things were not ready yet; that the apostles were not yet qualified nor able to preach the Gospel in all its fullness. It was in view of this the Lord said, "Peter, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." The mind of Peter and all the apostles, to say nothing of the disciples and the balance of the people, needed turning from their expectation of an earthly kingdom to a kingdom not of this world. When he saw the Lord on trial, he did not desire to be identified with him, as he was on trial for his life. He did not know what his fate might be.

Some one might conclude that some of those good women that followed him had a better understanding than these men. What, then, was the purpose of those who went to the sepulcher early on the morning of the third day? They were probably as intelligent as any of their time. Were they expecting him to rise? Not a word of it. But they were making preparation to embalm his body, to preserve it. When they came to the sepulcher, saw the stone rolled away, an angel sitting on it, looked in, saw the clean linen and napkin laid aside in order, but the body was missing, they were overwhelmed, and asked the angel, thinking he was a man, "Sir, have you removed the body of Jesus?" The angel said, "He is not here, but has risen as he told you he would, and goes before you into Galilee. Hasten and tell his disciples." They hastened away, with the grand theme burning in their hearts, and told it to the disciples, "and their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not." See Luke xxiv: 11. Thomas said, "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger in the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." See John xx: 25. From considerations like these, any person of ordinary intelligence can see that the apostles did not understand that the kingdom would be spiritual, but supposed it would be a worldly, civil government till Jesus died; and, even after he rose from the dead and appeared to them, they said, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" See Acts i: 6. This puts it out of the question about their preaching the Gospel in its fullness, or the kingdom being fully established and the reign of Christ in operation while he was in this world.

The time was now come to open a brighter chapter than any in the past, and see whether we have no better light than can be obtained from the apostles while they were unbelievers

themselves in the main matters to be preached. Now turn attention to where the Lord appears in the midst of the disciples, as you read John xx: 26–28, and hear him address Thomas: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said to him, My Lord and my God." There is no account of Thomas waiting to examine the nail-prints or the scar in his side. He is utterly overwhelmed when he sees the Lord standing before him alive. The Lord now proceeds: "All authority in heaven and earth is given to me. Go, therefore, and teach all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"—"Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He who believes and is immersed shall be saved, but he who believes not shall be condemned." This was entirely new, and the first time they were ever commanded to go into "all the world" and "preach the Gospel to every creature." Their former commission was to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," but "not in the way of the Gentiles." This limitation is now taken off, and they have the divine authority to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature"—to "disciple all nations." This new commission not only differs from the first one in the extent of the territory, or the population to which they were to go, but also in the substance of it. It contains different matter. Under the first commission, they were to preach that "the kingdom is at hand;" under the second, to "preach repentance and remission of sins in my name." The first commission was preparatory to the coming kingdom; the second was the administration of the Gospel under the new reign or institution.

But the Lord commanded them to "wait for the promise;" to "tarry in Jerusalem till you shall be endued with power from on high;" for the "Comforter shall come, and when he

is come, he shall guide you into all truth." He was still not ready for them to proceed, but continued to appear to them at intervals, giving abundant opportunity to see him, hear him, handle him, eat with him, and drink with him, thus making themselves competent witnesses of his resurrection. When about forty days had expired, and the preparatory work was all done, the time came for his departure. He loved the disciples and made a special request for them that they might be with him, and behold his glory which the Father gave him. See John xvii: 24. He took them out to Mount Olive, imparted to them his last benediction while on earth, bade them adieu, rose up in their presence and started away toward heaven. A heavy cloud was thrown in the background—it might be to give grandeur and splendor to the scene. As they stood gazing after him as he ascended up into heaven, a convoy of angels appeared and shouted, "Galileans, why stand you gazing up into heaven? That same Jesus that you see going up into heaven, shall so come in like manner as you have seen him going up into heaven."

As he approaches the everlasting city, the mandate is heard, "Lift up your heads, O you gates; and be you lift up, you everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in." Then a response is heard, "Who is this King of glory?" The answer is, "The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle." Then the shout is raised again, "Lift up your heads, O you gates; even lift them up, you everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in." Again the question is heard, "Who is this King of glory?" Then follows the final reply. "The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory." He entered heaven with all our names engraven on his breast, amidst the shouts of joy of all the hierarchs of the upper world, and the Almighty commanded all the angels to bow down and worship the Christian's Lord, the Messiah, Immanuel, God with us. Gabriel, Michael, Raphael,

and Uriel, with all the shining and burning hosts before the throne, bowed in profound awe, and worshiped the glorified Redeemer. The Infinite One, the I Am, the Jehovah, rose up and invited him to a seat in his throne. While all the celestial grandees of the spiritual world looked on our King, "the only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords" ascended the throne; "sat down at the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens." With his own hands the Almighty Father crowned him Lord of all; and as he could swear by no greater, he took an oath by his own great name, that he should reign till all his enemies should be put under his feet; till every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus is the Lord, to the glory of God.

The coronation ceremonies lasted about a week. During this period all was quiet on earth. Indeed, from the death of Jesus till this period there was not a preacher in the world authorized to utter a word in the form of preaching. All was silence and waiting. But when the King had ascended the throne and was crowned Lord of all—when all things were ready—the preparatory work was all done, the King proceeded, as he had promised, to send the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, to guide the apostles into all truth. The apostles, with about one hundred and twenty brethren, were all together in one place, waiting for the promise. The day of Pentecost had "fully come," and "suddenly there was a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." See Acts ii: 2. "And there appeared to them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat on each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

This brings us up to the place of beginning. The Lord said that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jeru-

salem." Jerusalem is, then, the *place* of beginning. Peter, after his first sermon to the Gentiles, in his vindication before his Jewish brethren, in view of receiving the first Gentile converts, said, "As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them (the Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius) as on us (the Jews, on Pentecost) at the beginning." That which was done on Pentecost was in the right *place* (in Jerusalem) and at the right *time* ("at the beginning"). Here, in Jerusalem, is the beginning *place*, and on the day of Pentecost the beginning *time*. The beginning time and place of what? The beginning of the reign of Christ; of preaching under the new, and, as may be justly said, the last commission; of repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ.

But some man inquires, what have you gained by preaching so long to find the place and time of beginning? Much is gained by it. Without finding this beginning there can be no clear and intelligible understanding nor preaching of the Gospel. The preacher without this beginning distinctly fixed in his mind, can no more preach intelligently than a pilot can run his ship to a given point placed out at sea without knowing what sea he is in, or without knowing where his starting-point is. He could run toward any point of the compass called for, but he could not tell you where nor when you would land, unless you would give him the place of beginning. In like manner, not a surveyor in the world can run a line till you give him the "place of beginning." You can not even make a deed to a lot of land till you find what is called "the place of beginning." Since surveying has come up, as an illustration, it may be used still further to good advantage. Suppose A and B join lands. They purchased their lands many years ago when lands were cheap, and they were not particular about the lines. But now the lands are worth one hundred dollars

per acre. Mr. A is looking at a fine spring near where the line is supposed to be, and noticing the crystal water as it ripples over the pebbles below. He also views a magnificent row of apple-trees and valuable fence, and thinks if the line were run out correctly the spring, trees, and fence would be on his land. He talks about it to his neighbors, and those who agree with him he regards as very intelligent people, much better and more desirable associates than those who differ from him. Indeed, those who differ from him he considers not very good people, and does not seek their company. Mr. B esteems those who think the spring, the trees, and fence are on his land, and seeks them for his associates. Thus the controversy continues for a time; but, finally, they decide to have the controversy settled. To this end they call the surveyor. But, on examination, the surveyor fails to find a corner-stone, a witness-tree, or land-mark of any description on the entire premises. What is now to be done? He refers to his field-notes and finds an established corner, it may be, some distance from the line to be run. After surveying, running lines in different directions, and sundry measurements, he points to a spot and orders the loose soil that he sees has been made there to be removed. When this is done they find the corner-stone, with the land-marks on it, corresponding to his field-notes. He plants his staff at "the place of beginning," places the compass on it, the needle settles, and he is now ready to take a look through the compass. A and B are no idle spectators, but are looking on with intense interest. No danger of either becoming drowsy now, though they may be first-class sleepers in church. Mr. A slips up and peeps through the compass, and perceives that his spring, trees, and fence are about to be cut off. Under much excitement and not in a very pleasant manner, he turns to the surveyor, and exclaims, It is all wrong, sir. The surveyor inquires

deliberately, What makes you think so? He replies, with much feeling, Why, do you not see that you are about to cut off my fine spring, my fruit trees and fence? How much attention do you suppose a surveyor would give to such talk? About as much as a Gospel preacher would give to the man who thinks the Gospel line wrong because it cuts off his church. He would probably tell him that he should have built his fence and planted his fruit-trees on the other side of the line, and that he will run the line according to law, as he is bound by his oath to do, if it cut off his house and barn into the bargain.

"But," shouts a man, "what would you do, when the Gospel line is run, if you should find yourself on the wrong side of the line?" Simply as the man did who had his land run off, and found his cabin was on the wrong side of the line; he moved *over the line*, on to the *right side*, and on to *his own land*. "But," says a man, "I despise to see a turn-coat; a man leaving one church and going to another." True, there is something a little unpleasant in turning one's coat. Still, there is one thing more ridiculous than a man turning his coat, and that is to see a man so obstinate as to wear his coat wrong side out rather than to turn it. It is much wiser and better to turn it, when it is found to be wrong side out, than to persist in wearing it wrong side out, even if some bigot should say "a turn-coat." If you make a mistake in roads, and go a wrong road several miles, it is unpleasant to turn and go back to where you got out of the road, but it is much wiser and better to do it than to continue on in the wrong road. Who will not admit that Luther did better, in turning, than he would have done to have continued in Romanism? The matter of *turning* all depends on the question whether you are right or not. If you are right, then by all means never turn. If you are not right then turn, the sooner the better.

But since a good illustration is at hand, it must not be thrown aside till well used. Suppose, then, that partition running through the center of the pews in front of the stand is the Gospel line, and that man sitting a little to one side of it is occupying the position of his church. As the preacher is starting out to run the line, he sees that he is to be left slightly on the wrong side, and rises and appeals to the preacher as follows: "Hold on, if you please, a little. I do love a charitable man. You see that my church is only a little to the wrong side; now we have many good praying members and good *paying* members, too; do please be charitable and bend the line only a little, and take my church in." Say the preacher is one of your pliable and charitable men, with an easy conscience, and he yields, saying, "There are good and bad in all churches; they are all right at heart," and bends the Gospel line so as to take them in. As soon as this is done, up spring three men, pleading for their three churches, only a little further from the line, telling how many good people they have, and that they are all good at heart, though they do not see precisely as other people. They, too, tell how they love a charitable preacher, and how good a man they think the preacher is. He has now commenced the work of bending the line, and will not make the matter any worse to bend it a little more. He, therefore, bends it and takes them in. Thus they continue to praise him for his charity, tell him how good a man he is, and persuade him to bend it a little more and a little more, till, finally, he is a Universalist, runs the line clear round the human family, and takes them all in, leaving no church, or no world, or all church and all world. This is the result of what these charitable folks will do when they carry out their principles, or rather, their want of principles, to their legitimate result. They would nullify the entire Gospel and make nothing of it.

Now, turn your eye back to Peter, as he stands up with the eleven, under the infallible power of the Spirit of God to guide him into all truth, on the brightest day the Lord ever created, the great Pentecost. He has a new commission, under which he has never preached. The Lord has gone into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens, and is crowned Lord of all. He now stands at the beginning. He has the keys of the kingdom of God. He now has the death of Jesus, his burial, his resurrection, the shedding of his blood, the office and work of the Holy Spirit, the ascension and coronation of the king, for the first time to preach repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus. He has before him Jews and proselytes, devout men from every nation under heaven. He is in the right place, in Jerusalem, and at the right time, when the Holy Spirit was poured out on them "at the beginning." For the first time he opens out: "You men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as you yourselves also know; him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, you have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain; whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains, death; because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." He declared to them that David had said that God had sworn that "he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne," and that "this Jesus, God had raised up" and "exalted to his own right hand." This was all new, having never been understood or preached before by any of the apostles, or any body else; and when they heard this they were cut to the heart, and cried out, "What shall we do?" Here stood the man who had the keys of the kingdom, ready to open the door, and, in one sentence he exercised the power, symbolized by the

keys, opened the door, or, which is the same, the way to God, the terms of pardon, in the following words: "Repent and be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Here one of the most singular things, in these times of apostasy and disloyalty to God, makes its appearance. Men talk about "called and sent preachers," but very few of them ever come to this grandest occasion since creation's dawn, where we have an account of "called and sent preachers," of their preaching, what they preached, that the preaching cut the hearers to the heart, what they inquired, and what they were commanded to do. They rarely come to those grand occasions, where the Holy Spirit came to guide these "called and sent preachers" into all truth and follow the directions given by the apostles to those inquiring the way into the kingdom. Why do they come not here if they have any love for what was preached "by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven?" Why do they come not here if they have what was preached by truly "called and sent preachers?" Why do they come not here if they delight in that which is truly the work of the Holy Spirit? Why, if they would understand how things were at the start, not come up here to the "beginning"? The reason is at hand; they do not receive the terms of pardon as laid down by Peter. They do not accept the use of the keys of the kingdom, as set forth in his words, opening the kingdom, or giving the terms of pardon. They have "another Gospel, which is not another," but a perversion of the Gospel of Christ. In turning away from the terms of pardon, set forth by the Holy Spirit through Peter, they have no terms. They have no plan of salvation, no definite terms, with which any person can comply, and have the promise of remission of sins. They can exhort the sinner to seek, to be-

lieve, to give up his whole heart, to keep back nothing, but never come to the promise of God that he "shall be saved." They have closed their eyes to the light of the Gospel, and are literally in the dark, on the way of salvation.

Some man responds, "But I do not believe in baptism for the remission of sins." Who has preached any "baptism for the remission of sins?" "You have done it, not five minutes since," he replies. Are you sure of that? "I am; I can not be mistaken," he replies. Well, you are not mistaken. You heard it, but it was when the precise words of Peter were quoted, "Repent and be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*," or, as before quoted, "*in order to the remission of sins.*" Do you say you can not receive any such teaching? If you do, it is to be regretted; but it can not be helped if you should refuse to receive one-half that is in the Bible. It is the precise language of Scripture, and if you refuse to receive it, you refuse to receive the precise language of Scripture. "I do not mean that," says a man, "but I do not receive *your interpretation* of it." There has been no interpretation of it given, nor any thing but the *precise words of Scripture*, and if you reject any thing it must be the language of Scripture. It is the *language* of Scripture that is here adopted, and not any man's *interpretation*.

"I want the evidence of pardon," says a man. That is all right. You ought to have the evidence of pardon. But where is the evidence of pardon? Is it an *old* revelation or a *new* one, in the Bible or not in the Bible, through Christ or immediately from God? You say "In the Bible." Right; it is in the Bible. Here it is: "He who believes and is immersed, shall be saved." Mark xvi: 16. Here is the evidence of pardon in the promise of Jesus, "Shall be saved." "Is that all the evidence of pardon?" says one. Is not that enough? "That is the

mere word," continues the objector. What do you mean in calling the Lord's word "the mere word?" Do you mean that it is not sufficient; that you can not rely on it? "The thief on the cross was saved without baptism," continues the objector. How do you know that the thief was saved at all? "I did not know that any body denied that." No matter whether any body denies it or not, how do you know that he was saved? Jesus said to him, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." True, Jesus said that, but that is "the mere word!" "Is not that sufficient?" Certainly it is; and if you have got so far that you can believe the word, turn back to the commission: "He who believes and is immersed, shall be saved." The words of Jesus are as true in one case as they are in the other. They are beyond all doubt true in both cases. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, repent and be immersed, and you have the promise that you shall be saved. Think of the power of the three words "shall be saved." If you can not depend on these words, it is not *immersion* you need, but *faith*. Immersion is of no value to any man who has no faith in the word of God, or not faith enough in it to rely on it for pardon, and even for the hope of heaven.

If the Lord were to take you from your seat to heaven, and set you down before the throne, and you should exclaim, as one of old, "Lord Jesus, I am a poor sinful man;" and the Lord should then reply, "Thy sins, which are many, are all forgiven," and then return you to your seat, you would spring to your feet in an ecstasy, exclaiming, "I am pardoned." But where is the evidence? Only in the words "Thy sins are all forgiven." You may trifle with them as you please, call them "mere words" or any thing else; but they contain the evidence of your pardon. Strike them out and you have no evidence of pardon.

"I intend to turn to God before I die; but there is time enough yet," says one. How do you know how much time there is yet? You are like the man in a yawl, two miles above the falls of Niagara, with two good oars, with his hands folded, floating directly on toward the great cataract. A man on shore calls to him: "My dear friend, there is danger ahead, lay hold of your oars and come to the shore, or you will go over the falls and precipitate one hundred and fifty feet down." He looks up with an air of indifference, and says, "I know there is danger ahead, but I am coming to the shore before I get to it." On he moves one mile, when another friend calls to him and entreats him to come to the shore. He still thinks there is time yet, and goes on another half mile. The last friend calls to him and entreats him to be aroused for his condition. He lifts his eyes, sees the vast spray rising, the rainbow in the mist, and hears the roar of the immense waters as they pour in majesty down; sees the mighty rush of the waters and the white-caps on the rapids above the falls; is filled with alarm; seizes the oars and struggles, but in a few moments discovers that it is too late. He calls to a man on the tower, "O, for help!" The man exhorts him to struggle for his life. This he does, now nobly, but it is too late. He writhes and cries, "O, why was I so simple as to wait till it was too late?" Over he precipitates, down he plunges into the fearful deep below, and is gone forever.

Will you, men and women of the world, waste your manhood and womanhood in sin and folly, and then entertain the thought of performing the work of a life-time in a death struggle, and being saved? If you do, depend on it, you may lament your folly where lamentation will avail nothing, where there is no repentance, but where the worm dies not and the fire is not quenched. "Turn, O turn, why

will you die?" While there is mercy, grace, and compassion, turn and live forever. "Whoever will," says the Lord, "let him come." "Come to me, all you who labor and are heavy laden; and you shall find rest." Come, O, come, and have the peace of God which passes all understanding.

SERMON, No. XI.

THEME.—PREDESTINATION AND THE FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

TEXT—"According as he has chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he has made us accepted in the Beloved."—EPH. 1: 4-6.

THE design of this discourse is to call attention to the teaching of the Bible on election, predestination, foreordination, and the foreknowledge of God. It is delightful to stand free from all creeds, theories, and embarrassing opinions of men, where one can look into the oracles of God simply with a view to understand them. In the present instance, there is nothing in the way to hinder the fullest and fairest investigation in determining what the Bible means by the important terms to be examined.

The terms predestination, foreordination, foreknowledge of God, election, determinate counsel, mystery, secret, and counsel of his will, are all Bible terms. A man of intelligence, in these matters, can not say he does not believe the doctrine of election, etc. Election is in the Bible; so is predestination. The same is true of foreordination, foreknowledge, etc. Whatever the Bible teaches by these terms is as true as what it teaches in any other terms, or on any other subject. But any man may say, in all good

conscience, if he understands the subject, that he does not believe the following from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith:

"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished. Those of mankind that are thus predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith and good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace." Con. of Faith, p. 18.

This, an intelligent man may say, he does not believe, or does not understand; but this is one thing, and the teaching of the Scriptures referred to, another and a very different thing. There is something in the Bible called "the foreknowledge of God." The question to solve is simply what is it? or what does it mean? This is the matter first to be settled.

"Foreknowledge" is to know before. But the word "know" is used in two senses in Scripture, as it is in our own time. When we say we know certain things, we mean that we are cognizant of them, or are informed of them. We speak of certain things which we know, or concerning which we have information, in contradistinction from certain things of which we are not informed. In this sense there is nothing which the Infinite One does not know; in this sense he knows every thing. The apostles said of the Savior that

he knew all things. The Almighty Father saw the end from the beginning. Nothing is hid from the omniscient one. In this sense there is neither foreknowledge nor after-knowledge with God. The word know is not used in this sense where we find the word foreknow or foreknowledge. When we read "known to God are all his works," the import is not simply that he is acquainted with all his works, or cognizant of them, for, in that sense, he knows every thing. The sense is, "approved of God are all his works." Another passage of the same kind is, "The Lord knows them that are his." If the word "know" were here used in the common acceptation, you might respond that the Lord knows them that are not his also. There are none whom he does not know in this sense. The Lord is not only cognizant of them that are his, or acquainted with them, but the Lord *approves* them that are his, as he does not approve them that are not his. The same is true of the words "Depart, you workers of iniquity; I never knew you." He surely did not mean I never was acquainted with you, but I never acknowledged or approved you as I have those that are mine. When the Lord speaks of knowing certain things, it is not in contradistinction from things with which he is not acquainted, or of which he is not informed, but sometimes in contradistinction from things which he has not *made known*, and sometimes things which he has not approved. When God looked down on the works of creation, he saw that they were good, or approved them, or rather made known his approval in pronouncing them "very good."

It is, therefore, very clear that when the Scriptures speak of "the foreknowledge of God," they do not mean simply that with which he was before acquainted. This falls far short of the meaning. They mean more than this. Let reference, then, be made directly to the law and to the testimony. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-

knowledge of God, you have taken, and, by wicked hands, have crucified and slain." Acts ii: 23. In this passage there are two of the strongest expressions of this kind found in the Bible, viz., "the determinate counsel" and "the foreknowledge of God." What is the import, or what did the apostle mean by these terms? The following passage, from the same apostle, on the same subject, is a clear and complete explanation of the words just quoted: "But those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his holy prophets, that Christ should suffer, he has so fulfilled." Acts iii: 18. It will be readily seen that what is called "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," in the second chapter, is here called "those things which God before has shown by the mouth of all the holy prophets," in the third. This defines the foreknowledge of God to be that which he had before shown by the prophets, in contradistinction from that which he had not before shown by the prophets. The following, from Paul, throws some additional light on the same point: "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham, saying, 'In thee shall all nations be blessed.'" Gal. iii: 8. Now, it is self-evident that precisely the same that is meant by "foreknowledge," in the passage previously referred to, is meant by "foreseeing" in the one last quoted. What is meant, then, by "the Scripture foreseeing?" Is it not God foreshowing in the Scripture, or showing by the mouth of the prophets? Another Scripture, of the same nature, says: "He has concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. iii: 22. This conclusion is foreknowledge of God, or God's conclusion before made known, through the prophets, that all are under, and that the promise to Abraham, by the faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe

The eternal purpose of God contained Christ, the Gospel, the plan of justification for the heathen through faith. The same was embodied in the promise made to Abraham, and confirmed by an oath. This was followed in after ages by many predictions, all, in one way or another, bearing on the great purpose of God to give this glorious system to man. In the New Testament frequent reference is made back to the purpose, the promise, the predictions of the prophets; and the knowledge thus communicated before is called the foreknowledge of God, in contradistinction to what was afterward fully unfolded and developed to the world by the apostles. This foreknowledge, determinate counsel, mystery, or secret, had in it Christ, the Gospel, the Church, justification of the heathen through faith, making the Gentiles members of the same body and partakers of the promise in Christ by the Gospel. This was the grand secret, hid in God for ages, and not made known to the sons of men as it is now revealed to the apostles and prophets by the Spirit. It was concerning this the prophets "inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come to us: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. To whom it was revealed, that not to themselves, but to us they did minister the things that are now reported to you by them that have preached the Gospel, with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into." 1 Pet. i: 10, 12. It was this same great secret that was before the mind of the apostle to the Gentiles when he concluded his letter to the Church in Rome in the following words: "Now to him who is of power to establish you according to my Gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made

manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. xvi: 25, 26. The Gospel preached by Paul, the preaching of Jesus Christ, and the revelation of the mystery are the same. It was a secret, but is now revealed; it was hid, but is now brought out; it was in the purpose of God, the promise, in prophecy, or foreknowledge, but is now embodied in a complete revelation of the Gospel to the world. The eternal purpose of God was to publish the Gospel of Christ to the nations of the earth. The promise contained the same thing—the Gospel in promise. The prophecies contain the same, with much more said about it, and the Gospel now contains the same, fully developed and published to the world.

The next thing in order will be to decide who the persons were, spoken of in the text, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. They were *elect; God's elect.* There is no use in caviling; the word "world," here, is not age. It is the material world. These persons were chosen in Christ before the founding of the material world, or before bringing order out of chaos. There are two questions to decide concerning these persons: Who were they? What were they chosen or elected for? They are not named in the whole passage, but simply referred to as "us," and "we." These pronouns occur a number of times between the third and thirteenth verses. No man understands the reading who does not know who is meant by these words. The matter in hand, then, is to find out who is meant by these two little words "us" and "we." Four different theories have been advocated, as now recollected. These must each, in return, receive attention.

1. Some Universalists have maintained that the words "us" and "we," here, mean all mankind, and that all mankind were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the

world. But this can not be, for certain things are said of them that can not be said of all mankind. It will not do to say that he "has made all mankind accepted in the Beloved." Universalists do not believe this themselves. They only claim that *he will* do this and not that he *has* done it, much less that he has "predestinated *all mankind* to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," or that "all mankind have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." It is not true that he had "abounded toward *all mankind* in all wisdom and prudence," nor that he had "made known to *all mankind* the mystery of his will." It is not true of all mankind that they had, in Paul's time, "obtained an inheritance," nor that all mankind "should be to the praise of his glory who first trusted in Christ." If all mankind *first* trusted in Christ, who trusted in Christ *last*, or afterward? At the thirteenth verse, the apostle says, "In whom you also trusted, after that you heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that you believed, you were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." How could the apostle say that all mankind had "first trusted in Christ," and, in the next breath, addressing the disciples in Ephesus, say, "In whom you also trusted?" "Also trusted," as well as whom? The saints in Ephesus also trusted in Christ, as well as all mankind. According to this, the saints in Ephesus were no part of "all mankind," but all mankind first trusted in Christ and then the saints in Ephesus also trusted in Christ. This is simply absurd.

2. Some have supposed that the words "us" and "we" mean the Jews. But this is equally absurd. It will not do to say that "he has chosen *the Jews* in him before the foundation of the world, that *the Jews* should be holy and without blame before him in love;" nor that "he has predestinated *the Jews* to the adoption of children by Jesus

Christ to himself;" nor that he "has made *the Jews* accepted in the beloved;" nor that "*the Jews* have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins;" nor yet that "he has made known to *the Jews* the mystery of his will;" nor had the Jews "obtained an inheritance" at the time Paul wrote this letter. Yet these things were true of the persons of whom the apostle was speaking.

3. The Calvinists think the words "us" and "we," from the fourth to the thirteenth verse, mean all the saints—their elect. Can what Paul says here be said of all the saints? Certainly not. Were all the saints "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ" when Paul wrote this? Certainly not, for millions of them were not yet born. Nor were all the saints "predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," nor had all the saints received "forgiveness of sins" at the time of this writing, nor were they "accepted in the beloved." It is not true that he "abounded to all the saints in all wisdom and prudence" at the time of this writing, nor that he "had made known to them the mystery of his will," nor that they had "obtained an inheritance," but all these statements were true of the persons of whom Paul was speaking. It is not true that all the saints "first trusted in Christ," but these persons "first trusted in Christ," and the apostle adds, verse thirteenth, "In whom you also trusted after you heard the word of truth." In whom you also trusted as well as whom? If he meant all the saints before, he means now that the saints at Ephesus also trusted in Christ, as well as all the saints. This makes nonsense of it.

4. Who, then, does the apostle mean by the words "us" and "we," from the fourth to the thirteenth verse? We have seen that the language can not apply to the Jews, to all mankind, or all the saints. To whom, then, can all this language be applied? It can be applied to the apostles and

prophets of the New Testament, and nobody else. The apostles and prophets were "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." They were "chosen in him before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love." He had "predestinated them to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," and he had, when Paul wrote, "made them accepted in the beloved." They had, when Paul wrote, "redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," and he had "abounded toward them in all wisdom and prudence." He had, when Paul wrote, "made known to them the mystery of his will," and they "had obtained an inheritance." They did "first trust in Christ;" and when the Ephesians heard the word of truth, the Gospel of their salvation, they "also trusted" in him, as well as the apostles and prophets. The apostles and prophets were chosen in him before the foundation of the world, and are the "us" and "we" of whom the apostle speaks, from verse three to verse thirteen—*the elect* of this passage.

As further evidence of the correctness of this, refer to the ninth verse. Here the apostle says, "Having made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he had purposed in himself." The word "us" here means the same persons of whom he had been speaking all along, and says, "Having made known to *us* the mystery." The mystery was made known to the same persons "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world." Who, then, were these persons to whom he made known the mystery? Turn to Ephesians iii: 3–5, where he says, "By revelation he made known to me the mystery, as I wrote before in few words, whereby, when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ; which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." The

"us," then, of chapter 1, verse 9, are the "apostles and prophets," chap. iii: verses 3–5. These apostles and prophets, then, to whom he made known the mystery, are the elect—the persons chosen in him before the foundation of the world.

Having now ascertained who these elect persons were of whom the apostle had been speaking, the next thing in order will be to ascertain what *they were elected, or chosen in him, for.* Were they elected for their own happiness and glory or for the benefit of others? Were they elected simply to eternal life *themselves,* or as instruments through whom others were to be benefited? The ground here maintained is, that their election had no more in it for them, in the world to come, than for any other persons of their time or any future time. They were not elected simply for *their own sakes,* but for the benefit of *the world.* What, then, were they chosen or elected for? Paul answers: "For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which was given to me toward you." What was this dispensation given to Paul? It was the dispensation belonging to this election. He proceeds: "How that by revelation he made known to me the mystery, as I wrote above (chapter i: 9), in few words, whereby, when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel." What was all this for? He proceeds: "Whereof," or, *for this purpose,* "I was made a minister," or one of the elect, "chosen in him before the foundation of the world." "To me," says he, "who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given." What grace? The

grace of election, of being chosen in Christ, to the apostolic office. What was this given for? He proceeds: "That I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of time has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." He still proceeds further, unfolding the purpose of this election to the apostolic office: "To the intent," or for the purpose, "that now to the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord." This passage most clearly and explicitly sets forth the object of the election of which the apostle had been speaking. The grace of election, of being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, was to preach the Gospel; to unite the Jews and Gentiles in one body, and to make all men see, or to make a revelation to the world. They were chosen in Christ, as the agents or instruments, through which God would reveal his will to man and found the new institution. This election had something in it, not merely for the elect themselves, but for all mankind. They were "chosen in Christ," "predestinated," and the "grace given them," that they should be instrumental in blessing the world with a full revelation of the mystery—the Gospel.

"But," says a man, "I will go to the seventeenth chapter of John, and find the persons that were given to Christ; they were the elect." That is so. But the same two things must be ascertained, as in the other case: 1. Who were the elect? 2. What were they elected for? Who, then, were the persons given to Christ, as set forth in John xvii: 2–20? Were they all mankind? Certainly not; for in verse sixth he says he gave them "out of the world." They were not all the world, but *out of the world.* Were they all the

saints? Manifestly not, for he says, verse 11 and 12: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name." They were not all the saints, for he "was with them in the world," and he was not with all the saints in the world. But he proceeds: "Those whom thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." From this passage, it is learned that one of those given to him, or one of the elect, was lost. The Calvinistic idea of the elect is, that they can not be lost; but here we have the clear concession that one of them was lost. This one was Judas. He was one whom Jesus had chosen, and one whom the Father gave him, and was lost. Why was he lost? On what ground was he lost? The following passage informs us: "And they prayed and said, Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show which of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas *by transgression fell*, that he may go to his own place." Acts i: 24. This settles the question, touching the ground on which he was lost; he was *lost*, or he *fell* by transgression. But now the question rises, What was he given to Christ for? Was it for his own happiness, for his eternal glory? Certainly not. What, then? For the *ministry* and *apostleship?* "This ministry and apostleship" from "which Judas *by transgression fell.*" Matthias was elected to take "part of this ministry and apostleship." No doubt, from other considerations, he was finally lost, but that is not what is meant here. He was given to Christ; was one of the chosen to the ministry, the apostleship, and from this ministry and apostleship he fell and was lost. Paul was also one of the elect, was under the necessity of having an eye to his conduct, lest having "preached the Gospel to others, he himself should be a cast-

away." 1 Cor. ix: 27. If, then, one of the elect, one of the chosen, one given to Christ, "by transgression fell and was lost" from that to which he was elected, and another one of the elect had to labor to keep his body in subjection, lest having "preached the Gospel to others, he himself should be a castaway," it would be well for others, even if they could prove that they are elected, not to rely too confidently on their election to save them. They, too, might *fall by transgression and be lost.*

But to return to John xvii, please examine carefully and see if you can decide who were given to Christ. The Lord proceeds, verse 20: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." This passage refers to three classes: 1. Those given to Christ, to whom he here does not confine his prayer, and through whose word others are to believe. 2. Those who should believe through their word. 3. The world, whom he desired to be convinced, by the union of the believers. The first class are the elect, the chosen, or the apostles, who were to preach the Word. The second class, the saints, or those made believers by hearing the words of the apostles. The third class, the unbelieving world, whom he desired to be influenced to believe by the union of the saints, or the believers.

The position is not here taken, and will not be anywhere in this discourse, that no elect is mentioned in Scripture but the apostles and prophets of the New Testament. The position here taken is, that the apostles and prophets of the New Testament are the elect of Eph. i: 4–12 and John xvii: 2–20. Having now determined, beyond dispute, that the apostles and prophets are the persons here spoken of as given to Christ, chosen in him before the foundation of the world—the

elect; and that this choice of God, or election, is to the prophetic and apostolic office, not for their own benefit or happiness, but as the instruments through whom God would reveal his will, make known the unsearchable riches of Christ, make all men see the wisdom and goodness of God are exhibited in this election, and none of that crude theory called Calvinism, or Augustinism, is found in it, or having any footing. It was a wise and benevolent purpose of God to elect those persons, or choose them in Christ for this great and good object, and all men have reason for thankfulness and gratitude to God for this election, but not for the Calvinistic *theory* of election. In view of all this, the apostle exclaims: "O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who has known the mind of the Lord? or who has been his counselor? or who has first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever." Romans xi: 33–36.

But other important passages must be considered. Some man exclaims, "Does not the Scripture say 'Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated?' and was not this written before these two sons were born, and consequently before they had done any good or evil?" The words "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," are Scripture, but they were not written before Jacob and Esau were born This passage is found in Rom. ix: 13, as quoted by Paul from Mal. i: 2, 3, and was written only three hundred and ninety years before Christ. The language "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," as we have it in the old English style, does not express the meaning of the original well. The full force of the original, as may be shown by any amount of authority, is, "Jacob have I *respected*, and Esau have I *slighted*." In what, then, did the Lord *respect* Jacob and *slight* Esau?

Did he elect Jacob to eternal glory and reprobate Esau to eternal damnation? Certainly not. There is not a word of this kind in the language of the prophet, nor in the comment of Paul on it. It will be seen by reference to the genealogy, as recorded by Luke, that the Lord's genealogy is traced from Joseph up, through *Jacob*, to Abraham, or, indeed, to Adam; and, by reference to Matt. i, that the genealogy is traced down from Abraham, through *Jacob*, to Christ. Esau being the first-born, or the elder son, it was his right by birth, or he had the birthright to be enrolled in the lineage, which was the lineage of Christ. But the Lord slighted him in striking his name out of this lineage, and respected Jacob in enrolling his name in the sacred line, in which the blood of Jesus was to flow. But this was not done by an immutable and an arbitrary decree. Esau was free, and acted as freely and voluntarily as any man ever acted in bartering away and selling his birthright to Jacob. This is clear from Heb. xii: 18, where Paul says, "Lest thereby any fornicator or profane person, as Esau, who, for one morsel of meat, *sold his birthright.*" The birthright, to be enrolled in the genealogy, was his; but he sold it, lost it, and could not get it again, not on account of any previous immutable decree, but by *his own free and voluntary act.* It was not eternal life he had lost, nor was the birthright lost by an unconditional, immutable, and an eternal decree, but by his own voluntary act. The very first sight of this case, as set forth in Scripture, demolishes a principal item in Calvinistic election. Their idea is, once in election, or, which is the same, in grace, always in grace. Esau was born elect, or with a birthright, and Jacob was born non-elect, or without a birthright; and Esau, born elect, lost the election, and Jacob, born non-elect, gained the election, retained it, and his name stands enrolled, and will so stand, among the elect in the genealogy of our Lord till the last trumpet shall sound.

But it was said to the mother of these children, before they were born, "the elder shall serve the younger." Rom. ix: 12, and Gen. xxv: 23. This did not mean that the elder shall be eternally lost, nor that the younger shall be eternally saved, nor did this find its fulfillment in the persons, or in the life-time of these two children, nor for hundreds of years after their day. As an evidence of this, you will notice, that after Jacob had served his twice seven years for Rachel, and become quite wealthy, and when he was on his return to his own country, he learned that he was about to meet Esau, at which he was alarmed, and sent presents to appease Esau's wrath, for fear he might suffer from him. He feared that Esau might remember the little transaction about the birthright when they were boys. This circumstance shows that Esau was no servant of Jacob at the time they here met, but was the more powerful man, and that Jacob feared him. But, by attention to the language, it will be seen that the language does not say, nor imply, that the servitude was to be in Esau's own person. The Lord said, "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thee; and the elder shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." Gen. xxv: 23. This was a prediction to ancient Rebecca touching *two nations and two manner of people* that were to descend from her, or from her twins, not yet born—Jacob and Esau—the descendants of the latter designated "the elder," and the descendants of the younger designated "the younger," in the brief and very elliptical prediction.

These two nations were, in course of time, respectively called Jacob and Esau, or Israel and Edom; and when the Lord uttered the words, Mal. i: 2, 3, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," he alluded to the two nations, called Jacob and Esau, or Israel and Edom, and not to the two men, Jacob and Esau, in their own persons. Israel

he had respected, in making them the elect, through whom the Messiah was to come, and passing the sacred genealogy through them, and slighted Edom in not passing the sacred line through them, and they finally became servants of Israel. The transaction about selling and purchasing the birthright is not merely an amusing story, about two boys, to entertain children, but apparently an unimportant transaction between two boys that had a divine purpose in it, and turned the line of our Lord's genealogy from the course it was apparently about to take through the nation of Edom, and running down through long and eventful centuries, in the nation of Israel, from whom our Lord came. This is the election here, and there is no other in this transaction.

"But," says a man, "the Scripture says, 'Has not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel to honor and another to dishonor?' Are we not clay in the hands of the potter? Is not the Lord the potter? Are we not merely passive in his hands? Will he not make us, then, as seems good in his sight? Paul, Rom. ix: 21, alludes to this figure, as found Jer. xviii: 1–10. The Lord is the potter. The people of whom he is speaking are the clay in his hands, and he has power to make them vessels of wrath or of honor, as seems good to the potter to make them. The prophet says: 'The word which came from the Lord to Jeremiah, saying, Arise, and go down to the potter's house, and I will cause thee to hear my words. And I went down to the potter's house, and, behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel he made of clay was marred in the hands of the potter; so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it. Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, O house of Israel, can not I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are you in my hand, O house of Israel.'" Jer. xviii: 1–4. It occurs some-

times, when the potter is turning a vessel on the wheel, that it mars or breaks in his hand. When it does this, what is the cause of it? Is it because he wills or decrees it? Is it because he desired it to break in his hand? Surely not. It is contrary to his will. Why, then, does it break in his hand? Because the clay is not good. The failure is not in the will or decree of the potter, but in the *bad clay*, that can not be made into a good vessel. But the potter has the power, when the clay is bad and breaks in his hand, to make it over again, as seems good to the potter to make it, into another vessel, a coarser and rougher vessel, for some less honorable purpose. With this explanation, please hear the words of the prophet, and try to learn the reason why the Lord makes some vessels to honor and others to dishonor; for he *has the power* and *will make* some vessels to honor and some to dishonor. The Lord says, "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do to them." Please, notice this language carefully. *If* what? "*If that nation*, against whom I have pronounced, *turn from their evil*, I will repent of the evil I thought to do them." It turns on their behavior. The Lord has the power, and if they turn from their evil, he will turn away his wrath. But, now, hear the Lord state the other side: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that obey not my voice, them will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." What is the ground here on which he will refuse to benefit them? What is the contingency? *If* what? "*If it do evil in my sight, that obey not my voice*, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." What does the whole matter turn on? On

the *obedience* or *disobedience* of a nation. If it disobeys the voice of God and does evil in his sight, he will make it a vessel to dishonor, or utterly overthrow it. If it shall do good, obey his voice, he will raise it up, and make it a vessel to honor.

From all this, it is clear that it entirely depends on the clay, the house of Israel. Unless wicked nations turn from evil and obey the voice of God, they will be overthrown and made vessels to dishonor. The same is true of individuals as well as nations. This teaching is confirmed by Paul, 2 Tim. ii: 21: "If a man, therefore, shall purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel to honor, sanctified and fit for the Master's use, and prepared to every good work." This is as clear as language can be, showing that the whole matter of being a vessel to honor is conditional—that *if a man shall purge himself from these*, he shall be a vessel to honor. Men are not wicked because God makes them vessels to dishonor; but he makes them vessels to dishonor, *because they are wicked*, as a punishment. When God speaks to men, nations, and kingdoms, to pluck up and pull down, if they repent, obey his voice, turn from their evil, he will make them vessels to honor and fit for the Master's use. Let men, nations, and kingdoms, then, tremble before the majesty of heaven and earth.

But the Scripture says, "He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens." Certainly, the Scripture says so, and it is as unquestionably true as any thing ever uttered. The Lord will have mercy on some and harden others. This is divinely true. But there are several things not explained in this. 1. It is not explained whom God will have mercy on, and whom he will harden. 2. It is not explained *why* God will have mercy on some, nor *why* he will harden others. These are matters to be inquired into. On whom, then, will the Lord have

mercy? Turn to Exodus xx: 5, 6: "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them (images), nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generations of them that hate me; and showing mercy to thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." On whom will he have mercy? On them that *love him and keep his commandments.* Why will he have mercy on them? *Because they love him and keep his commandments.* On whom will he visit iniquity? On them that *hate him.* Why will he visit iniquity on them? *Because they hate him.*

Turn to Neh. i: 5, and hear the word of the Lord: "I beseech thee, O Lord God of heaven, the great and terrible God, that keepeth covenant and mercy for them that love him and observe his commandments." On whom will he have mercy? *On them that love him and keep his commandments.* Why will he have mercy on them? *Because they love him and keep his commandments.* The whole matter turns on the character of men, and not on any immutable decree of God. Listen to the Savior, Matt. v: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." They who *are merciful themselves* shall obtain mercy. The holy apostle says, "For he shall have judgment without mercy, who has showed no mercy." Jas. ii: 13. The man who is himself merciful, shall have mercy, and the man who has showed no mercy, or is unmerciful, shall have no mercy. The Lord will not have mercy on him. The Lord will have mercy on whom he will have mercy. This is decreed. When he tells whom he will have mercy on, it is on those that *love him and keep his commandments;* and when he explains whom he hardens, or makes vessels to dishonor, it is clearly seen that they are *those who hate him* and disobey his voice.

It should also be distinctly understood, that there are two

senses in which God is said to do things: 1. When he does things directly, without any contingency. 2. Where he permits them to be done. In this latter sense he hardens men. In that sense he hardened Pharaoh. Hence you read in the Bible of Pharaoh hardening himself and of God hardening him. God only did by *permitting* it. Pharaoh *did directly, by his own acts.*

Listen to the word of the Lord once more: "The righteousness of the righteous shall be on him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be on him. But if the wicked will turn away from all his sins that he has committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die. All his transgressions that he has committed, they shall not be mentioned to him; in his righteousness that he has done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God; and not that he should turn from his ways and live? But when the righteous turns away from his righteousness, and commits iniquity, and does according to all the abominations that the wicked man does, shall he live? All his righteousness that he has done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he has trespassed, and in his sins that he has sinned, in them shall he die." Ezek. xviii: 20–24. If any thing can be clearly stated, this passage states the case clearly, showing whom God will have mercy on, and who shall surely die. *The man who turns from his sins shall surely live; he shall not die;* but *the man who turns away from his righteousness shall not live; he shall surely die.* Such is the immutable decree of God touching those on whom he will have mercy, and those whom he will harden.

Does any one desire a fuller explanation touching the question whom the Lord will harden? Listen to the following: "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and

with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; *because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.* And *for this cause* God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe the lie: that they all might be condemned *who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.*" 2 Thess. ii: 9–12. The decree of God, then, is that he will have mercy on them who love him and keep his commandments, and harden those who hate him and receive not the love of the truth. Men are not, then, vile and sinful because God hardens them; nor do they refuse to receive the love of the truth because he hardens them, but he hardens them *because they receive not the love of the truth—because they are vile and sinful.* On the other hand, men are not good because God has mercy on them, but he has mercy on them because they love him, obey his voice, do those things that are pleasing in his sight.

"But I do not believe that men can fall from grace," says one. That may be. Men do not believe things that are true, in some instances. What say the Scriptures? "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, *if they shall fall away,* to renew them again to repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame." Heb. vi: 4–6. Certainly none but Christains, saints, those in Christ, in grace, have tasted the heavenly gift, partaken of the Holy Spirit, tasted the good word of God or the powers of the world to come. Yet Paul speaks of such, and of their *falling away,* as well as the impossibility of renewing them again to repentance.

Hear the apostle again: "For if we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no

more sacrifice for sin." Heb. x: 26. Surely none but saints ever received the knowledge of the truth, and if such sin willfully, there remains no more sacrifice for sin. This shows that saints may sin, and that, too, so greatly as to lose their interest in the only sin-offering—the Lord from heaven.

The theory that men can not fall from grace is clearly contradicted and refuted by the closing words of the Book of God: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book." Rev. xxii: 19. Certainly none but saints ever had a part in the book of life, and in the holy city, and most indisputably, if a man has his part taken out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, he is fallen and undone forever. But hear the apostle once more: "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of none effect to you, whoever of you are justified by the law; YOU ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE." Gal. v: 3–4. Here is an end to the controversy—a final settlement of the question.

Do you desire, then, the Lord to have mercy on you; that he may not harden you; send you strong delusions, and make you vessels of dishonor? Then remember his word, that he will have mercy on them that *love him and keep his commandments;* on them that are *merciful,* and that he will send strong delusion on those who *receive not the love of the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness.* As you desire that he may not make an example of you, as he did of Pharaoh of old, harden not your hearts against him, but receive the love of the truth, obey his voice, and he will have mercy on you. You may run and will, as Esau did, after he sold his birthright; but you must remember that

it is God who shows mercy, and he has clearly defined that he will have mercy on the merciful—on them who love him and keep his commandments, and not on them who hate him and obey not his voice. You may will and run, argue and contend that God will save you; nay, more, that he will save all; but if you do not love God, and keep his commandments, he will not have mercy on you.

God has made you free, and says: "To whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are to whom you obey; whether of sin to death, or of obedience to righteousness." Rom. vi: 16. "If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." Again says the Lord: "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated me and my father." John xv: 22–24. The Lord does not say, "You *could not* come to me," but "you *would not* come to me that you might have life." The light has come into the world, and men choose darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.

"But," says a man, "does not Jesus say, 'No man *can come to me*, except the father who has sent me draw him?'" Yes, sir, he so says, and proceeds at once to tell how the father draws them. The next verse says: "It is written in the prophets, they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that has heard, and learned of the father, comes to me." John iv: 44, 45. The father taught them by the prophets; they *heard* and *learned* this teaching of the father by the prophets, and were thus *drawn to the Savior*.

"But, I do not believe any man can come till the Lord gives him power," says a man. To whom does the Lord give power? "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that be-

lieve on his name." John i: 12. To whom gave he power? "To as many as received him"—"to them that believe on his name." He did not give to them the power to enable them to believe, or to receive him, but he gave those who received him and believed on his name *power to become the sons of God.*

The Lord cried over the devoted city: "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets and stonest those who have been sent to thee; how often *would I have gathered* thy children as a hen gathers her brood, but *you would not.*" Here is the true reason why men are not gathered to the Lord: *they will not be gathered.*

SERMON, No. XII.

THEME.—THE NECESSITY OF REGENERATION.

TEXT—"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."—MATT. v. 8.

THE words selected and read, are not designed as a text, in the popular sense, but merely as a starting-point, in discussing a great theme—*the necessity of regeneration*, or, which is the same, simply *the necessity of turning to God*. No attempt will be made, in this discourse, to discuss regeneration or conversion minutely, but the *importance of it* will be argued and maintained; or, rather, the *indispensable necessity of it*.

The Sermon on the Mount, as it is generally styled, was delivered some three and a half years before the full development of the Gospel and kingdom, and no one need expect to find, in that discourse, the details of the new institution; or the law of induction, the plan of founding churches, the officering, management, and discipline of the congregations, as these matters were unfolded and developed afterward. It contained, as might have been justly expected, the general principles of the new and better covenant on better promises. In this opening speech, one of the great principles unfolded is, that reference is now to be made to the *state of the heart*: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Some of the translations, no doubt correctly, too, instead of this word "blessed," give us the word *happy*. "Happy are the pure

in heart." The word "see," here, does not mean to see with the eye, for in that sense "every eye shall see him." It is here used in the sense of *enjoy*. "Happy are the pure in heart, for they shall *enjoy* God." Here, then, in the Lord's great opening discourse, soon after he had entered his divine mission, he makes a grand discrimination between purity and impurity, the pure and the impure in heart. When he says "Happy are the pure in heart," he implies, with all the force of language, that the impure in heart are not happy. The principle is, that purity of heart and happiness go hand in hand. Impurity of heart and unhappiness also are joined hand in hand. Men may flatter themselves that they will escape, that they can cherish impurity of heart and still be happy, but they will find themselves mistaken. The immutable decree of God has settled it, that impurity and misery shall be joined hand in hand; that purity and happiness shall be joined hand in hand. Men may try to evade as they please, but still, there stands the law, facing them and thundering in their ears, "Happy are the pure in heart." No man can be happy with an impure heart. A man must be made pure in heart before he can be happy.

Thus far it all relates to the present, without looking into the future, and some Universalist may say, that the passage sustains his doctrine, that rewards and punishments are all in this life, that the Lord simply says, "Happy *are* the pure in heart," and not that they shall receive this happiness in the future. Such an idea might be possible, if there were nothing different anywhere else, and if the Lord had not added the clause "for they shall see God." This makes a discrimination between the pure and impure in heart, in reference to the future. All who have noticed Universalists, in their writings and preaching, have observed what a world of trouble they have with such words and phrases as the following: misery, torment, punishment, hell, the lake

of fire, second death, the devil, Satan, etc. Still, if not one of these words or phrases could be found in the Bible, and we were to read in the first sermon of our Lord, "Happy are the pure in heart, for they shall enjoy God," there would be no hope remaining that the impure in heart would ever enjoy God. It throws an everlasting gloom over the prospects of the impure in heart in reference to the boundless future.

Seeing, then, that both present and future happiness stands connected with purity of heart, as our Lord taught in his first sermon, it becomes a matter of great importance to determine what he meant by "pure in heart." There is a great tendency in these times, to mix up things and make it appear that all men are pretty much alike; that they all have some good in them, and some bad; that there is not much difference after all. You will hear men saying every now and then, "I never knew a man so bad that he had not some good in him; nor a man so good that he had not some bad in him." Still, these same men know that there is a vast difference between men. There is a vast difference between an apple-tree that yields abundance of fruit and *nearly all good*, and a tree that yields but little fruit and *nearly all bad*. So there is a vast difference between a man whose conduct is *nearly all good*, and a man whose conduct is *nearly all bad*. Some men's lives are nearly all filled up with good deeds, while some others are so nearly filled up with bad deeds that it is only an occasional thing to find a good deed. This is a wide difference.

But this is not ascertaining what it is to be pure in heart. It is not, then, to be so perfect that one can not sin, be overtaken in a fault, or surprised into an evil. The "pure in heart" are those who ardently desire to do good, are aiming and striving to do good; who hunger and thirst after righteousness. They purpose good in their hearts, intend or design good. Their meditations are good, pure, and holy.

If they sin, they are surprised into sin, or overtaken in a fault. But the impure in heart, or, which is the same, the corrupt in heart, meditate sin, design it, purpose in their hearts frauds, blasphemy, corruptions in general. Their designs, desires, and aims are corrupt. How transcendently are those who are pure in heart, whose desires, aims, and intentions are all pure, above the low, the corrupt, and degraded! They have an abiding consciousness of the purest, holiest, and highest intentions. They are not faultless, perfect, or immaculate, as Jesus, or as angels. They are not utterly sinless, and do not claim to be; but they desire the perfection, purity, and holiness of Jesus, and are seeking after it. These are pure in heart *now*, and *happy*. They, also, have the promise that they shall in the future *enjoy God*. But if Universalists could annihilate hell and the devil, as they appear so determined sometimes to do, this passage would stand eternally in the way of the impure or corrupt in heart ever enjoying God. No reasoning in this universe can ever recover them from this.

But that there may not appear to be too much suspended on a single isolated expression, another passage shall be summoned: "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. xii: 14. This is fuller than the language just commented on. It not only includes the purity of heart, but the practice flowing from it, without which it unequivocally declares, no man shall see the Lord. The word "see," here, is used in the same sense as before; that is, "without holiness no man shall *enjoy* the Lord." If you could annihilate the devil, hell, the second death, lake of fire, the bottomless pit, misery, punishment, and torment, the case is not relieved. There stands the terrible declaration, "without which no man shall enjoy the Lord." No matter where the man or woman is, or who, *without holiness no person shall enjoy the*

Lord. No evasion, caviling, or sophistry can get over this. There it stands, and there it will stand till the eternal judgment, testifying that men must follow peace and holiness in this life, or they shall not enjoy the Lord in the future

Being made "pure in heart" amounts to the same as being made holy, for it leads to following peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall enjoy the Lord. No man is regenerated, born again, or converted, according to the New Testament, who is not made pure in heart, or holy in life. An argument in favor of being made pure in heart, or holy, is an argument in favor of regeneration, the new birth, or conversion, and the law requiring purity of heart, or holiness, is virtually a law requiring a man to be born again, regenerated, or converted. It is not claimed that these several terms mean precisely the same, but the man converted, created anew, or born again, is made pure in heart, holy, or he is regenerated. Though being made pure in heart is not the whole process of turning to the Lord, or regeneration, it leads to it and results in it. Hence the faith of Christ begins with the heart, corrects it, changes, or purifies it. This purification of the heart leads to a pure life, or corrects, or purifies the life, resulting in righteousness and true holiness. But no reasoning on a subject like this can be as satisfactory as an actual conversation between a man and the Savior of the world. Attention is, therefore, invited to an actual conversation between our Lord and a no less distinguished personage than Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, who came to the Savior by night to have a personal interview. It is not certain that there is any thing in the circumstances of his coming *by night*, but those a little accustomed to notice the movements of religious teachers, might think there was a little lack of bold manliness. The cause of his coming by night is not entirely clear, and might be assumed tc be that he was not willing for it to be known

that he had the interview; or that he was under the influence of a little policy, such as is often seen on the part of religious teachers and spiritual guides, inducing them to be cautious about setting an example that might open the way for weak brethren to hear something not orthodox. Many amusing things are observed on the part of spiritual guides of our own times, who really desire to hear, but fear the influence of their example, and slip in late, take the first seat they can find. They sit, sometimes, as if they did not desire any one to see them there, and then show their contempt and low-breeding by going out while the closing hymn is being sung. Politeness is not to be expected, nor even common civility from a man who has once become a blind devotee to party, and such a man will violate rules of politeness in such rudeness as he would rebuke in an infidel.

Nicodemus may have been under no such low and unworthy feeling as just alluded to, but the probability is that some such influence caused him to go at night. Be this as it may, he put on the best address he could command, and approached the Savior in the most respectful terms he could use. He said: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou doest except God be with him." He used the title rabbi in about the same sense as some do the titles "Rev.," "Rt. Rev.," "Dr.," etc., as prefixes or affixes to names, not having consequence enough to pass without some such appendages. He evidently was aiming to please the Savior, and supposed he would be pleased, as the Jewish rabbis were, to be called rabbi. Hence he addressed him, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher from God." This was making a broader concession than many of his fellow-rabbis would thank him for. He not only speaks for himself, but for others *with himself:* "*We* know that thou art a teacher from God." Nor does he speak in any doubtful

terms, such as *we think, we feel, we trust,* or even ***we admit,*** but in the most unequivocal terms, "*We know.*" Nor does he, like many of the present time, say "we know," without telling how he knew. He adds: "For no man can do these miracles which thou doest except God be with him." Certainly this was a good reason for saying, "We know that thou art a teacher from God." No one could perform the wonderful works which he did unless God was with him.

The Lord looked on him in view of the admission he had made, and the very first sentence he uttered struck from under him his entire religious foundation, thus leaving him standing among his fellow-citizens of the world, but outside of the kingdom of God. Hear his words: "Verily, verily, I say to you, except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." This was all new to Nicodemus. He understood nothing of the meaning of this language, and, in confusion, inquired how a man can be born when he is old, evidently seeing nothing beyond a natural birth, or a birth of the flesh. He did not see that it was a deadly blow at his birthright membership in the Church, and a clear declaration that his old birthright gave him no membership in the new kingdom about to be introduced. The Lord then proceeded in language a little fuller: "Verily, verily, I say to you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Nicodemus stands in wonder and amazement. The Lord replies, "Marvel not that I said to you, you must be born again." Why did the Savior address him in this style? Why did he say, "Verily, verily, I say to you, except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God?" See how emphatic he is: "Verily, verily," is *most assuredly.* "Most assuredly, I say to you, except a man be born again, he can not see the

kingdom of God." The word "see" here is used in the sense of *enjoy*—"except a man be born again, he can not enjoy the kingdom of God."

Why does the Lord thus address the ruler in Israel? For a good and a wise reason. He knew that not only Nicodemus, but all Jews, would be ready to claim membership in his Church, or, which is the same, under a different form of speech, citizenship in his kingdom, on the ground of their fleshly birthright, or their fleshly relation to Abraham, and not on being born of the Spirit. At the time of this conversation, the thought had never entered into the mind of Nicodemus that the Messiah, when he came, would change the entire ground of membership, so as to set aside entirely all claims on the old ground, and require all members of the old church, on the old ground, the same as Pagans, to become members on the new ground, or not enter the kingdom at all. This the Lord declared to the rabbi in Israel, though he evidently did not understand it, nor any one else at that time. From his earliest recollection, his fleshly birthright, which gave him membership in the old church, was the ground of membership to which his attention had been directed. He had never in his life heard of such a thing as a spiritual qualification for membership in the Church, or a moral condition. As far as he had ever heard, *flesh* and not *spirit*, *blood* and not *faith*, the *first birth* and not the *second*, had been kept before him as the ground of membership. The descendants of Abraham, according to the flesh, or, as the Lord expressed it, "those born in thy house," and not those "born again," were in the covenant. This was the ground of membership, and the only ground with a Jew.

This was a startling point to the Jew. It appeared to him like setting aside the law of God. It was, indeed, superseding one ground of membership with another, and a

different one, or rather superseding one institution with another, and a different one. The matter now is not to be Abraham's children according to the flesh, but Abraham's children by faith; not to be of *fleshly Israel*, but of *spiritual Israel*. They are not all of Israel, who are so according to the flesh. It is written, "In Isaac shall the seed be counted." It is of the spirit and not flesh, of faith and not of a blood relation. A Jew is nothing now, circumcision is nothing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. We have no confidence in the flesh now, or in a fleshly relation to Abraham. Away with your long rolls of genealogy, and your controversies about them. It matters not now whose children you are, or whose descendants; nor is it a matter of any consequence whose blood flows in your veins; whether your fleshly descent is from Isaac or Ishmael, from Jacob or Esau; whether you are of this nation or that. The question now is, have you been "born again," "born of the Spirit," "born of God," made "a new creature?" The question is not whether you have the blood of Abraham in your veins, but whether you have the faith of Abraham.

It is useless to set up the cry of unchristianizing good people. This has nothing to do with the argument. Is the ground taken true? Is it true that, in order to be in the kingdom of God, a man "must be born again"—"must be born of water and of the Spirit?" It is as certainly true as that the Bible is a divine book, or as that Jesus is divine. Men must be born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, the word of God; not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the will of God. The saints are in Christ, not by flesh nor by blood, but by faith, by the spirit of God, by yielding themselves to the will of God to be servants of God. This is true as Holy Writ. It cuts off no one. No one can be cut off from the Church who was never in it. No one was ever in the

Church of Christ who was never "born again." The argument may show many that they were never in the Church, and thus give them the opportunity to enter into it, but it will never cut any off who were never in it. In the same way it never unchristianizes any one. No one who has never been christianized can be unchristianized. Nicodemus had never been christianized, and consequently was not unchristianized by any thing Jesus said. He was only shown, or would have been shown if he had understood the Lord, that he was never in the kingdom—never christianized. The same would be true of thousands now if they should understand this teaching; they would learn simply that they had never been in the kingdom, and could not be cut off from a kingdom which they had never been in; that they had never been christianized, and consequently could not be unchristianized.

What does the Lord mean by the words, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God?" This language was not understood by Nicodemus, nor any other man of his time. Nor is it well understood now. It will, therefore, be necessary to bestow a little careful attention to its elucidation now. There is but *one birth* here, and not two, as some have supposed. It is *one birth*, "of water and of the Spirit," and not *two births*, one of water and one of Spirit. This is so clear from the structure of the language itself, that it is useless to argue it here. What does this figurative word "birth" here stand for? or, in other words, what does "born again" mean, or amount to, in literal language? It literally means turned to the Lord, converted, or made a Christian. That is all there is in it. But, returning again to the figure "born of water and of the Spirit;" what is the sum of it? In order to a literal birth, there are two things necessary: 1. Begetting. 2. Birth. Those two parts are in-

cluded in our Lord's figurative language. One of these parts is ascribed to the Spirit, and the other to the water, as the one, in a natural birth, is ascribed to the father, and the other to the mother. When a child is born of its parents, or of the father and mother, it is clearly begotten by the father and born of the mother. In the figurative language in hand, the begetting is of the Spirit and the birth of the water.

But what is the precise thing meant by being begotten of the Spirit? It is precisely the same as begotten of God, for it is of God, of Christ, of the apostles, and of the word of God, and ascribed to God, Christ, the Spirit, the apostles, and the Word, but in different senses. It is ascribed to God as the author of it; to Jesus as the Mediator, by whom it is effected; by the Spirit as the agent; by the apostles whom he employed to speak the word, and by the word as the instrument by which it is done. Literally: what, then, is done when a man is begotten of God? *He is made a believer.* This is the sum total of what is meant by the figurative expression begotten. "Begotten of God" is *made a believer* by means ordained of God. When a man is begotten by the word of truth, he is simply made a believer by the word of truth. When the apostle says "I have begotten you by the Gospel," it is, literally, I have made you believers by preaching the Gospel to you. Paul ascribed this begetting to himself in view of his instrumentality in preaching the Gospel. He could have ascribed it to the Spirit, as the agent who spoke through him, or to God, who gave the Spirit, as the author of it all, or to the word as the immediate instrument through which they were made believers. The part of the work, then, in the expression "born of water and of the Spirit," ascribed to the Spirit, is *making the believer.* The part ascribed to the water is baptism. It amounts to the same as the words in

the commission, "He who believes and is immersed, shall be saved." The part ascribed to the Spirit stands for *belief*, the part ascribed to the water stands for immersion, and entering into the kingdom amounts to the same as "saved;" for all who enter the kingdom are saved or pardoned, and none who do not enter the kingdom are saved or pardoned.

But some one is ready to say, "You are not to assume that 'born of water' is the same in amount as baptism." Why not? This language was applied to baptism by Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and all the distinguished reformers. It is so applied by all the authorities of note in all the libraries. This very language is quoted and applied to baptism in the Episcopalian creed, the Methodist creed, and the Presbyterian creed, and the churches having these creeds have so held from the commencement of their existence. There is, then, nothing novel in taking this ground. The strange part is, that those who have had this in their creed from the commencement of their church existence, should now repudiate it. The sum of it is, then, that the Lord taught, by the figurative expression, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of God," the same he did afterward, literally, in the words: "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved"—"or except a man shall believe and be immersed he can not be saved." The difference is only in form of expression and not in substance.

"But," a man exclaims, "our preacher explains all that by quoting the words, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Before your preacher or any body else can explain any thing by quoting that passage, he must tell us what that passage *itself means*. No passage can explain any thing unless the passage itself can be understood by the

person for whom the explanation is made. But it must be here stated that this passage is not quoted to explain any thing. It is quoted for the purpose of hiding a dark or obscure passage, and appearing to be explaining when nothing is being explained. It is a little like Dr. George Campbell, of Scotland, in quizzing a student about a sermon he had heard. He asked the student what he thought of it. He replied that it was very great. "What was there in it that was great?" said the doctor. "It was profound," replied the student. "What was there in it profound?" inquired the doctor. "It was deep," responded the student. "Muddy water always appears deep," said the doctor. That is the way with referring to this passage, it is to get into muddy water to appear *deep*.

But now some attention must be bestowed on this obscure passage, and an effort made to ascertain what the Lord meant. No man, who never read any thing but the common version, is to blame for not understanding this Scripture, for it is wholly unintelligible. The first thing, then, will be to show that there is nothing about "wind" in the passage—that the Lord is not telling what the wind does, or what it does not; what it is like, or what it is not like. He is talking about the Spirit; not merely *spirit*, but *the Spirit;* what *the Spirit does—the Spirit of God*—and not what the wind does or does not do. The original Greek word rendered "wind" here, in the common version, is *pneuma*, and the following reasons are given to show that it does not mean "wind," and should not be so translated:

1. *Pneuma* is not the Greek word translated "wind" in other passages where we know "wind" is meant. The Greek word *anemos* occurs thirty-one times in the New Testament, and is rightly translated "wind" in every instance in the common version. If the Lord had meant "wind," he would unquestionably have used *anemos*, which

means wind, and not *pneuma*, which means *spirit*. *Pnoes* is, in one instance, translated wind in the common version, and that, too, where it is clear that wind is meant.

2. *Pneuma* occurs three hundred and eighty-six times in the New Testament, and is not translated "wind" in any other instance but that one in the common version. It is the original for *spirit*, and is translated "spirit," or its equivalent, "ghost," in every instance where these words are found in the common version, with probably one exception. What ground had the translators for turning aside here, and where *pneuma* not only means spirit, but *the Spirit of God*, translating it "wind?" They had not a reason in the world for it.

3. The same original Greek word *pneuma*, occurs in four other instances in the same connection, and is translated "spirit" in each of these four places in the common version. By what rule did they, in the same connection in our Lord's discourse, and on precisely the same subject, translate *pneuma*, spirit, four times and wind once? There can certainly be no reason for this. The Lord meant spirit every time he used the word *pneuma* in this passage, and in the case in hand he meant the Holy Spirit, or *the Spirit of God*.

But some further attention must now be given to the King James' version of the passage. No man is to blame for not understanding this passage if he never heard any thing but the common version. It is simply unintelligible. Please pause and look at it. It starts out with the word "wind." Well, what does it make our Lord say about the wind? Why, simply, that "the wind blows." Well, that is precisely what the wind does—it *blows*. Where does it make the Lord say the wind blows? "Where it listeth." This old English word "listeth" means *pleases* or *wills*. The wind blows where it *pleases* or *wills*. But the wind

has neither pleasure nor will. Pleasure and will belong to intelligence and not to inanimate matter. But what more does the common version make the Lord say about the wind? "Thou hearest the sound thereof, and canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth." Which is it that this version makes our Lord say, Nicodemus could not tell, whence it came, nor whither it went, the sound or the wind? Certainly he could have told whence the sound or the wind either came. But it makes the Lord proceed, "So is every one that is born of the Spirit." What is the point of comparison here? What is every one born of the Spirit compared to? Is he like the wind or the sound? or is the influence of the Spirit like the wind? This can not be, for Nicodemus could tell whence the wind came and the influence of the Spirit. The more you try to understand this passage from the common version the darker it appears

But now turn aside from the common version, and dismiss all idea of "wind" from your mind, or the Lord, in this connection, making any allusion to the wind. He has a much greater theme than wind. He starts with "the Spirit"—to tell what *the Spirit does*. "The Spirit breathes." What means this word "breathes"? Saul breathed out threatenings against the disciples. How did he breathe out threatenings? Breathed them out in *words*. "The Spirit breathes where he pleases or wills." The Spirit is an intelligence, and it is consistent to speak of his breathing where he will. He has a will or pleasure, and does as he *wills or pleases*. Well, he breathes or inspires where he wills or pleases, and "you hear his voice." This shows that the breathing results in uttering words with the voice, else you could not hear *his voice*. Jesus said to the apostles, in view of their preaching under the last commission, "It shall not be you that speak, but *the Holy Spirit shall speak in you*." The Holy Spirit speaks in the apostles, and men

hear his voice; but at the time the Lord talked with Nicodemus, neither he nor any other man knew whence this voice of inspiration came, nor whither it tended. That was not yet opened up. That was true and applicable in the case of Nicodemus and all others then, but not of us now. The Lord does not say to us now that we can not tell whence this voice of the Spirit of God comes nor whither it tends. It comes from heaven, clothed with all authority. The Spirit of God inspires or breathes where he pleases, and you hear his voice. What is the result of hearing his voice? "So is every one that is born of the Spirit." Instead of "born," here, we should have *begotten:* "So is every one that is begotten of the Spirit." Still this leaves the passage dark. There is one word wanting to complete the sense. "So," or, in this way, "is every one *begotten* that is *begotten* of the Spirit." In what way? By hearing the voice of the Spirit. The Spirit of God breathes where he will, or inspires where he pleases, and through these inspired persons you hear his voice and *are thus begotten by the Spirit.*

This makes the passage teach the same as "I have begotten you by the Gospel," which is the same as made you believers by the Gospel, or "begotten by the word of truth," which is the same as made you believers by the word of truth. Whether this is correct or not, one thing is certain, it makes it teach *truth,* as *taught in other passages.* This is safe at least, and makes it intelligible, and doubtless it is the meaning of the passage.

Speaking of the entire process of turning to God, under the figure of being "born again," the Lord said to the rabbi of Israel, "Marvel not that I said to you, that *you must be born again.*" This is putting the case in strong terms. It is not that you ought to be born again, that it would be well to be born again, or that you should be born again, if you

feel like it; but "you *must be* born again." This includes the whole—the faith, being made pure in heart, repentance, and being immersed—the entire process, or regeneration. It is something that *must be.* Regeneration is not simply something that may be, ought to be, or should be, but something that must be. It is indispensable. Having now seen that our Lord, when speaking of the process of turning to God, as a whole, declares it to be something that *must be,* let a few moments be spent in looking at some of the parts of the process and see if he speaks of them in the same unequivocal manner. Faith is a part of the process, the first part, and that which makes the first impression on the human soul, and leads to every thing else following in the conversion and new life. How, then, does the Lord speak of faith? It is indispensable. Hear the word of the Lord: "Without faith it is impossible to please him; for he who comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. xi: 6. He does not say, that it would be well for men to believe, that men should believe, or that men ought to believe; but that "he who comes to God *must* believe." That which the Lord says *must be,* can not be set aside, except at the peril of him who does it.

Please look at another item. Is repentance indispensable, or something that must be? "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." But some one will say, "It does not say you *must repent.*" Do not be too certain of that. What does the Lord mean by the word "except?" "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." We must have his own comment on this. "Except a man be born again he can not enter into the kingdom of God." A few words further on, he says, referring to the same thing: "Marvel not that I said to you, you must be born again." He here explains his words, "Except you be born again,

you can not enter into the kingdom of God," to mean "You *must be* born again." So, when he says, "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish," it is the same as "You *must* repent or perish." The Lord does not trifle with men, but informs them what they *must* and what they must not do. There is no such thing as dispensing with repentance any more than faith. "He who comes to God *must* believe, and it is equally true that he who comes to God *must* repent. There is no coming to God, on the part of any human being, without these indispensable prerequisites. Without these, a confession, an immersion, joining a church, communing, deeds of charity, etc., would all avail nothing. They *must be in their place.*

"Well," says a man, "I am glad that it does not say You *must* be immersed." In that you may find yourself sadly mistaken. It does virtually say, "You must be immersed." Turn, if you please, to Acts ix: 6, and you will find the account of the Lord's appearing to young Saul, and proclaiming to him, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom you persecute." Saul inquires, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The Lord replies, "Arise and go into the city, and it shall be told you what you must do." The Lord does not say, It shall be told you what is your duty to do, or what would be well to do, what you ought to do, if it accords with your way of thinking, or if you *feel like it*, but *what you must do.* The Lord appears to Ananias, and commands him to go to Saul and tell him what he must do. Ananias says, We have heard of this man, and learn that he is persecuting all who call on thy name. The Lord explains that he had appeared to him, called him to the ministry, and shown him how great things he shall suffer for the name of Jesus, and that he was actually praying to him. Ananias, hearing this explanation, hesitates not to go to him, to tell him, as the Lord commanded, what he *must do.* Acts xxii: 16, we

learn what Ananias told him to do, in the following words: "Why do you tarry? Arise, and be immersed, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord." In these words, he told him, as the Lord commanded, what he *must do*, in doing which he commanded *him to be immersed*. This was one thing, then, that the Lord said he *must do*. It is, then, one thing that men *must do now* in turning to God. It is the terminating act in turning to the Lord. It concludes the process.

This is no stronger than the Lord's own language: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." "Born of water" is undoubtedly an allusion to immersion, and, as before stated in this discourse, is quoted and applied to baptism by all the standard works, the creeds, and principal authorities. The Lord gave significance and authority to this institution, when he came to John the Immerser and demanded immersion of him. John excused himself, saying, "I have need to be immersed of thee, and comest thou to me?" The Lord replied, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness." John yielded, in view of this exposition, and immersed him. Ascending the bank of Jordan, they lifted their eyes, and saw heaven opened and the Spirit, in a visible form, descending and resting on the Lord. The Almighty Father made this the occasion to introduce his Son to Israel, and spoke from his excellent glory, saying, "This is my Son, in whom I am well pleased." The Lord still further shows the importance of this ordinance, in saying, as he did to certain Jews, "You rejected the counsel of God against yourselves, not being immersed by John." If men, in refusing to be immersed by John, rejected the counsel of God against themselves, what will be the result in rejecting the greater immersion, appointed by our Lord,

"into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?"

But you shall be detained no longer, now, with the discussion of the importance of immersion. It has been shown clearly that a man *must believe*. The reason of this is, that faith changes or purifies the heart, and prepares it for the service of God. Unless the heart is thus prepared, nothing good can follow. It has also been shown that a man *must repent*. The reason of this is, that repentance is such a change in the mind as will result in a change in the future life—prepares him in character or life for the new state or relation. When the heart is changed by faith, and the life is changed by repentance, the subject is ready for induction, or initiation, or for a new state or relation. When Saul had believed and repented, and Ananias told what he *must do*, it was what he must do in addition to his faith and repentance, in order to salvation from past sin and admission into the kingdom. In order to this end, he was commanded to be immersed. The reason that a man must be immersed is, that in immersion he is initiated or inducted into the kingdom, the new state or relation. The heart being already changed by faith, and his life already changed by repentance, he is ready for the enjoyment of the new state or relation. Faith does not initiate any one into a new state, but only changes the heart and prepares a person in heart for the new state. Repentance does not initiate any person into the new state, but only prepares the person in life for initiation. Immersion does not change the heart or life, but changes the state or relation of the person previously prepared in heart and life by faith and repentance for the new state or relation. Nor is immersion the evidence of a *previous* pardon, but the last step in order to a *future* pardon—a pardon promised on certain conditions. "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." "Except a man be born

again he can not enjoy the kingdom of God," or enjoy justification, salvation from sin, or pardon.

"That teaching is unreasonable," says a man. No, sir; it is not unreasonable. There is nothing more reasonable and certain than that a man must be born again before he can enjoy the kingdom of God, enjoy God himself, or our Lord Jesus the Christ. That the unregenerate, the unconverted, or the people of the world, as they are in their sins, can not enjoy God, is as evident as any proposition ever uttered. Look at it for a few moments. Here is a man who is moral, truthful, honest, and honorable as a man of the world; kind and good as a neighbor and in his family. He stands transcendently above the immoral, the lying, corrupt, debased, and dishonest. He says to himself, "I am as good as many in the Church. I speak the truth, deal honestly, live morally, and would not do many things that members of church do, and if I should die, I believe I shall be saved." Well, sir, suppose you come up here and take the front seat at the Lord's table, as you are already so good, and join in the celebration of the Lord's death. You, no doubt, will be happy in contemplating his great sufferings for our sins, and partaking of the emblems of his body and blood. Come, sit with the saints and view him, as he hung on the cross, crowned with thorns, his hands nailed to the cross. Look at his face, all crimsoned with blood, and all his muscles in a quiver, as he is in the very agonies of death. View him, oh! view him, and keep your mind on him till, in your imagination, you see him breathe the last breath, silently expire, and his head fall lifeless on his breast. See the thick darkness gathering down over the whole land. Oh! try and realize the wonderful surroundings, the trembling earth, crumbling rocks, and the parting of the vail in the temple! Come, as you are good; sit here and contemplate this scene. You respond "No." Again, you say

"No; I can not enjoy such a scene; I can not come." No, you can not come. Your heart would revolt at the thought and shrink back from the scene. You are as conscious as you are of your existence that you would be miserable to attempt to participate in this institution. Your soul revolts at the idea, and you say, "No, friends, let me have a seat in some remote part of the house, or walk out." Yes, dear sir; and, for the very same reason, if you were in heaven, you could not enjoy it, and would want to walk out.

Every man not converted, born again, or not regenerated, knows this to be the case. There is an utter incongeniality, on the part of the unconverted, with Christ, his religion, with his Church and worship, or, of course, they would be attracted and drawn into it. They know that they do not enjoy the apostles' teaching, the prayers, praises, thanksgiving, exhortations, and communion—the immediate mingling in the worship; you always see the class alluded to in a remote part of the house, or entirely outside in time of communion. They feel much better at a distance. Suppose such a one were carried up into heaven and seated among those who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, and he would lift his eyes, and survey the immense throng, from every nation, and kindred, and tribe, and tongue, and people, who have loved Jesus, worshiped, devoted themselves to him and honored him in this life, and hear them lift their voices and sing "Blessing, and glory, and honor, and power, and dominion, and thanksgiving to him who sits on the throne, and to the Lamb forever and ever," and suppose he lifts his eyes, and sees Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Enoch and Elijah, Job and Daniel, Isaiah and Jeremiah, with all the ancient worthies, arrayed in white, and praising God and the Lamb, would he be prepared to join in the grand anthems? He looks again, and beholds the apostles of Jesus, immense ranks of the mar-

tyrs of Jesus, as they walk the streets of the New Jerusalem. He looks again, and sees the long ranks on ranks of the angels of God, in the most profound awe and subordination, praising and adoring God and the Lamb. He beholds the grand throng which no man could number, redeemed by the blood of Jesus, and, turning his eye, sees Jesus, in the midst of his sublime glory, as he sits on the throne in the heaven of heavens, and beholds the face of the Almighty Father of heaven and earth. Would not the spirit of him who could not come to the Lord's table, and who could not enjoy the worship of God in this world, utterly fail here? Will not such call for rocks and mountains to fall on them and hide them from the face of him who sits on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?

The reflection, then, that Jesus loved me, that he died for me, that he gave himself for me, that he, in transcendent kindness, invited me to come to him and *I would not*, will thunder home on the conscience. Such language as the following will then rush into the mind: "Come to me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "He who comes to me, I will in nowise cast out." "The Spirit says, Come; and the bride says, Come; and whoever will, let him come and partake of the water of life freely." These invitations, he will remember, were all slighted, and are now gone forever. His opportunities are all gone, and he is not regenerated and not conformed to the image of Jesus; not created anew. We need something more to make us happy than mere admission into a place of happiness. We must be regenerated, made new creatures, or we could not be happy among the happy, in heaven itself. Turn, then, to the Lord, enter the covenant, and live forever. Come with Christ, become conformed to him and made inexpressibly happy in him now and prepared to

enjoy him forever and ever. Remember the word of the Lord, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." "Marvel not that I said to you, *you must be born again.*" "No man comes to the Father, but by me." "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me." "I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last, the bright and morning star." To his name be honor and power everlasting.

SERMON, No. XIII.

THEME.—UNION OF CHRISTIANS.

TEXT—"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."—EPH. iv: 4-6.

THE subject in hand is the union of the people of God. It is necessary to have a clear understanding at the start. It is not the union of "professors of religion," "professed Christians," "Christian sects," or "Christian denominations," that is to be considered, but simply the union of *Christians*, those who are truly *the people of God*. The union of others, before they are converted to God, is not in view nor desirable. They will do less harm divided than united. Two propositions will be discussed in this discourse and sustained:

I. God requires all Christians to unite in one body.

II. There is a common ground on which all the people of God can unite without any sacrifice of truth or conscience.

Those two points being well cleared up, the way is open for the union of all God's children, for them to be one, to dwell in peace and love. To the work in hand, then, let attention be directed.

I. God requires all Christians to unite in one body.

Something of immense value may be learned by careful attention to the practice of the most devoted and pious

Turn your attention, then, to this class for a few moments There have been some in all ages who have read the Scriptures and worshiped in their families. What kind of prayers have been going up to heaven from these pious family circles for generations past? Among many subjects of prayer the union of the children of God has been one constant subject. The cry has been ascending to heaven from the pure in heart, the true and the holy, "O that the time may come when we shall all see eye to eye, and walk hand in hand." Will this supplication all be lost, or will it yet be answered? It will be answered as sure as the Lord lives. Turn your attention to another place of prayer. There is a meeting they call the "prayer-meeting." This is not a popular meeting. It usually averages from three up to twenty. At this meeting a few of the true and the holy, the devoted and pious, come together, frequently without any preacher to dispute about depravity, effectual calling, final perseverance, or any of the antiquated bones of contention that never had any substance to keep a saint from starving, and they engage in devout supplications. Here, again, the fervent petition wells up from a devout heart: "O that the time may come when all jars, discords, and divisions shall be done away forever, and when all the saints shall be united." These holy cries have not been ascending to heaven in vain for ages past. They are all treasured up in the mind of the most gracious and merciful Father in heaven. They will one day all be answered.

But turn your attention to the great "union prayer-meeting," in some city, where a thousand meet on a morning for prayer. A brother rises to speak, and all eyes are turned toward him. His whole countenance is lighted up. He commences: "I believe the millennium is coming; I never was so happy in all my life. Here we are from different churches, all on one floor, without regard to our differ-

ent views or denominations." A hundred voices are heard at once, "Thank God for it." They all solemnly bow down, and the prayer goes up to heaven: "O that we may all speak the same thing; be of the same mind and the same judgment; be perfectly joined together, and that there may be no divisions among us." These petitions are not, and will not, be lost. They will all be answered.

"I wanted Scripture," says a man, "and not prayers; these prove nothing." Do not be mistaken. They contain the righteous sentiment of the souls of the pure and the holy. Please turn your attention to one more prayer. Just before the Lord suffered he poured forth his holy soul in that wonderful prayer, usually styled his intercessory—truly and properly "the Lord's prayer"—the prayer he *prayed himself*, and not the one he taught his *disciples to pray*. In the midst of his solemn and sublime supplications he says, "I pray not for these alone; but for them also who shall believe on me through their word. That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John xvii: 20, 21. What is the sum of this prayer? 1. It is a prayer for all who shall believe through the words of the apostles. 2. The prayer is that they *all may be one*. 3. The manner of the oneness—to be one *as he and the Father are one*. 4. What is to be accomplished by the oneness or union—that *the world may believe*, or that the world may be converted.

Do you inquire how, or in what sense, he and his Father are one? They are one in mind, in the work of saving man, in the will of God to save men—one in the same Gospel, the same Church, ordinances, worship, and every thing. They work in perfect harmony, in the same mind and in the same judgment. There is not a jar nor a discord between them. They coöperate in the same work. This is the way in

which the saints should be one—as Jesus and his Father are one—in the same work, in the same mind, and the same judgment, without a jar or discord. The tendency of such union would be the conversion of the world, for he adds, "That the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Can any one having the Spirit of Christ fail to pray for such union? If we pray for it, can we fail to labor for it? Where the love of partyism prevails, they not only do not pray for union, but teach the people that it is a wise providence of God that we have so many churches, and thank God for them, as extended means of grace.

Before the founding of the Church, and speaking of it prospectively—John x: 16—the Lord said: "There shall be one fold and one Shepherd." The "one fold," or one flock, spoken of here is the Church or kingdom. When he uttered this he did not see any wise providence of God in having *many folds* and *many shepherds*, but authoritatively declared "There shall be one fold and one Shepherd." Again—1 Cor. x: 17—Paul says: "For we being many are one bread," or one loaf, "and *one body;* for we are all partakers of that one bread," or one loaf. Again—1 Cor. xii: 12—he says: "For as the body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, *are one body;* so also is Christ." In the next verse he says: "By one Spirit are we all immersed into *one body*, whether Jews or Gentiles, bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." There is, then, but one body or Church, or, which is the same, but one kingdom of Christ. Hence you read of the one fold, the house of God, the family of God, the building of God, the temple of God, God's husbandry, etc.; and while these are all figurative expressions, the same idea of unity is all the time maintained in all of them.

In the first chapter of the first letter to the Corinthians,

the apostle alludes to divisions partially formed in the Church, and the passage is so instructive that it must not be passed by with a single remark. Some apologize for the divisions now existing on the ground that they are not about vital or fundamental matters—that they are about unimportant and non-essential matters. On that account the divisions are not of much consequence, and excusable. But what were the divisions, coming into existence and rapidly culminating at the time the apostle wrote this letter, about? Were they about fundamental matters? Certainly not, but their preferences for their preachers. Some said, "I am of Paul;" others, "I am of Apollos;" or, to modernize it, "I am a Paulite; I am an Apollosite," etc. There was no fundamental question at issue among them. The questions in dispute were quite non-essential; simply about their preferences for their most public and influential men. Some were for one, and some for another. 1 Cor. iii: 4, he says, "While one says, I am of Paul: and another, I am of Apollos, are you not carnal? Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom you believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?" 1 Cor. iv: 6, he says: "And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself, and to Apollos for your sakes." This prudence he exercised to avoid the mention of names more immediately involved. Why did he not excuse the matter on the ground that the divisions were about unimportant matters—merely about their preferences for their preachers? Instead of this being an excuse, it was the more shame for them that they should be divided about such an unimportant matter as the preferences for their public men.

The next item of importance appearing in the case is that division among Christians is an evidence of carnality. 1 Cor. iii: 3, he says, "For you are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are

you not carnal, and walk as men?" Jude says, "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, not having the Spirit." Jude 19. *Carnal* is the opposite of *spiritual.* "Sensual" is the same as carnal, or fleshly, and Jude explains more fully by adding "not having the Spirit." People who have divisions are carnal, sensual, not having the Spirit.

Another important item of instruction derived from this passage is that it is not allowable to assume a human religious name, or to call a body of Christians after a man, or to take the name of a man as a religious designation. If it were right to take the name of any man as a religious designation, it would certainly be right to take the name of such a man as Paul, Peter, or Apollos. Yet Paul makes a direct argument against this. Hear him: "For it has been declared to me of you, my brethren, by those of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." 1 Cor. i: 11, 12. This is the state of case as he finds it. In order to show them how absurd and ridiculous their position was, he puts the question, "Is Christ divided?" Their position implied that Christ was divided. This question he put to the whole of them, knowing that there could be but one answer. The Lord is one—a unit. Then, with propriety, he turns to those who said they were of Paul, or that they were Paulites, and inquired, "Was Paul crucified for you?" If you are to be Paulites, Paul should have been crucified for you, but as Paul was not crucified for you, there was no ground for saying you are of Paul. This reasoning he knew sensible people would apply to all other names as well as the name of Paul. But he proceeded to press them still more tightly: "Were you immersed into the name of Paul?" He knew that they all

would say certainly we were not immersed into the name of Paul, but "into Christ." He proceeds further to argue that he gave them no ground for saying they were of Paul, or Paulites, by adding: "I thank God that I immersed none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I immersed into my own name. And I immersed also the house of Stephanas; besides, I do not know whether I immersed any others." 1 Cor. i: 13–16. This language needs a little careful attention in this age of perversion. He does not say, as many quote, that he thanked God that he never immersed many, nor even that he had not immersed many of the Christians, but, speaking to those who said they were of Paul, "I thank God that I immersed *none of you*"—you who say you are of Paul, only the few specified. Why does he thank God for this? Because he did not think immersion of much consequence? No; that is not his reason. What, then? He adds, "Lest any should say I had immersed *into my own name.*" He might have added, For here are some saying I am of Paul, and I am thankful that I never gave them any ground for saying "I am of Paul," not even so much as to have immersed them, excepting a few. From this reasoning, the following is clear:

1. That as Christ was crucified for them, they should be called after him.

2. As they were not immersed into the name of Paul, but into Christ, they should be called after Christ, and not after Paul, or any other man.

3. That it is schismatical and sinful to have any human leader or name in the kingdom of God.

4. That as Christ was crucified for them, and they had been immersed into Christ, into one body and one name, they should remain in union in the one body and the name of the Lord.

But now for the remedy where Christians are divided. What did he entreat or beseech these divided Christians to do? Does he make some feeble excuse for them that they can not see alike; that they differ in their personal appearance; that there are varieties in all nature, and tell them that it is a wise providence of God that they are divided, etc. Not a word of it. What, then? Hear his holy entreaty: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that you be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." Where this divine authority prevails there is an end to division among Christians. Where it does not prevail, rebellion against God prevails.

But now turn to the text read at the outset, Eph. iv 1-6: "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation wherewith you are called, with all lowliness and long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The apostle alludes to his being the prisoner of the Lord to touch their hearts. He, no doubt, remembered the solemn and affectionate parting when he in person separated from them, and when they "sorrowed most of all for the words which he spoke, that they should see his face no more." Having alluded to his being "the prisoner of the Lord," he entreats them to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace He then proceeds to give seven reasons why they should endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit, or, which is the same, maintain union. These reasons are as follows:

1. "There is one body," or *but one body*. The argument is this: Inasmuch as there is but one body of Christ, or one Church, we should endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit.

2. There is "one Spirit," or *but one Spirit* to dwell in the one body; and as there is but one Holy Spirit to dwell in the one body, or Church, we should endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit, or maintain union in the body.

3. There is "one hope," or *but one hope* for the whole family both in heaven and on earth. As we all have but the one hope, we should endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit—maintain union among all who have this one hope in the one body.

4. There is "one Lord," or *but one Lord*, the head of the one body, and, inasmuch as there is but one Lord, the head of the one body, we should keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

5. There is "one faith," or *but one faith* from God for the one body; and as there is but one faith for the one body, we should all endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit, or strive to maintain union among all God's children.

6. There is "one immersion," or *but one immersion*, the initiatory rite for the one body. It is not one sprinkle, one sprinkling, one pour, or one pouring; nor three immersions into three names, but "one immersion" into one name, one body, or Church; and, as there is but one immersion into one body, we should endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit.

7. There is "one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." This is the grand culmination of all his reasons for keeping the unity of the Spirit. As there is one God, or but one God and Father of all, above all, and through all, and in you all, you should endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit, or maintain union among the children of God, in the one body. Such is the apostle's argument in detail. It may all be summed up in one sentence, as follows: As there is but one body or Church; but one Spirit to dwell in that one body; but one

hope set before that one body; but one Lord, the head of that one body; but one faith in that one body; but one immersion, the initiatory rite of that one body; and but one God and Father of all, above all, through all, and in you all, the author of it all, we should endeavor to maintain the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace, in that one body.

So far, then, as Scripture authority can settle any thing, these scriptures and reasonings show that God requires all Christians to unite. The way is now clear for the second head introduced at the commencement.

II. There is a common ground on which all the people of God can unite without any sacrifice of truth or conscience.

Negative preaching generally does not amount to much, but it may be of some importance to show up some ground on which union is not possible. This can be done by an illustration. Suppose, then, you were in a vast convention of fifty of the religious parties, all largely represented by preachers and private members. Suppose, further, that they have all agreed that the Lord requires the union of Christians. They are now in convention, searching for ground on which they can unite. Archbishop Purcell proceeds to address the convention as follows:

"I am rejoiced that you have all agreed that God requires union among all the people of God. We in Holy Mother Church have held this all the time; but I never saw my way clear till now to propose union. But as you have now all agreed that union is right, I am encouraged to propose a plan of union. Here I have in my hand the oldest creed in the world. Our Church is the oldest and the largest church. Look at our tall spires and massive cathedrals in all parts of the world. Look at our extended schools and colleges. See, too, what an extended ministry. Here is the Church and creed for union. Here is the true union ground

where we stand. Now, all you who are willing to unite on one creed and in our church, hold up your hand." He stands and looks over the convention in immense suspense and astonishment, seeing but one hand—the Romanist hand—high up, while there are forty-nine down. He takes his seat and hangs down his head in discouragement.

A bishop in the Episcopalian Church rises next and says: "I did not think we could ever agree to unite in the Roman Catholic Church. There has been too much persecution in that body for us Protestants. We never could unite there. But I have risen to propose union in our church and on the Prayer-Book. Our church is older than many others, and is now considered an established thing. The Prayer-Book is older than the most of your creeds, is entirely orthodox, and, I believe, the best book in the world except the Bible. We have a learned ministry, an elegant literature, and the most elegant church edifices in the land. Now, I trust, you will all see that we occupy the true ground of union, and that you will all unite with us in our church, and on our creed. All you who are in favor of uniting on our ground, will please hold up the hand." He stands in anxiety, looking over the house and sees one hand—the Episcopalian—high up, but forty-nine down. "Is it possible that there is but *one out of forty-nine* for our church?" he exclaims, and takes his seat.

Next comes Dr. N. L. Rice, of the Presbyterian Church, with the Confession of Faith in his hand, exclaiming, "I knew that you could never unite in the Roman Catholic Church. I have no doubt you have read my lectures on Romanism, delivered in Bardstown, Kentucky, many years ago, in which I showed up the dangers of that church. As to my friend, the Episcopalian bishop, he and myself are on good terms, but I did not think you could unite with him on his Prayer-Book. But here I hold in my hand the best

book in the world except the Bible; this blessed little book the Confession of Faith. Here is the book on which we can unite. Here each point of our doctrine is stated clearly and concisely, and below it is the scripture that proves it. Then look at our wise church polity, with our presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies. Then look at our learned ministry, our extended literature, our elegant church edifices, colleges, and theological schools. Here is the ground for union. All who are for union on our ground, in our church and on our creed, will please hold up the hand." With anxious suspense, he looks over the house and sees one hand—the Presbyterian hand—high up, but forty-nine hands down. *Forty-nine* against the Presbyterian ground of union for *one* for it. There is no possibility of union on that ground.

He is not more than seated till up comes a Methodist bishop, Discipline in hand, who proceeds to speak as follows: "I know that you could never unite in that old persecuting church—the Romish—and I also knew that you would never agree to unite in the Episcopalian Church. We Methodists have read how Episcopalians persecuted Father Wesley for forming his little praying societies, meeting innocently in them, and praying for more personal holiness and a deeper work of grace. Nor could we Methodists ever think of uniting on the Presbyterian Confession, containing what Father Wesley called 'the horrible decree of election and predestination,' and that other doctrine, that church officers have power to open and shut the kingdom of God, to remit and retain sins, as taught under the heads 'Decrees,' and 'Church Censures.' But now, here is our most excellent book of Discipline, with its twenty-five articles, its general rules, its arrangement for class, its mighty ministry, circuit-riders, presiding elders, and bishops; its great book-concern, with all its massive publications, spacious church edifices, schools, colleges, and theological schools. I do be-

lieve our church will take the world. Now here is our ground of union. All who are in favor of uniting with us on our ground, in our church and on the Discipline, will please hold up the hand." He stands in awful suspense and looks, and, to his profound astonishment, there is but one hand up—the Methodist hand—and forty-nine hands down *Forty-nine* against and *one* for Methodism! He takes his seat with the others. Do not say this is only a piece of imagination. You can not deny that this is the way they would vote, if they were here and acting on the subject.

Some man shouts from the audience, "Try the Campbellite church, and see if they will fare any better." That is a puzzling matter It is said they will not write out their doctrine, and that no man knows what they believe. It must not, therefore, be expected that a statement of the doctrine, or the ground, be presented. The best that can be done for the case is promised. Suppose, then, there is a man of that order here and he takes the stand and says, "I have found the true ground of union, the catholicon, the grand panacea for all your troubles." He puts in his plea, states his doctrine, and square out calls it "Campbellism," and, crying aloud, calls for all who are for uniting with him on his ground to hold up their hand. In profound amazement and astonishment, he sees *not one hand up.* Nobody is for it. It is hoped, therefore, that it will not come in the way any more.

But what is to be done? No ground of union is developed. But far back a little man is seen, of quick step and venerable appearance, advancing toward the stand. To the astonishment of all it is "Paul the aged." He takes the Bible in hand and says, "I see a passage in this book that I wrote eighteen hundred years ago, under the inspiration of the Spirit of God. It reads as follows: 'All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine,

for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works.' 2 Tim. iii: 16, 17. I understand that you all admit that the things I wrote, except where I explained that it was my own advice, were from the Lord. As these Scriptures (holding the Bible) are from God, and profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction, that the man of God may *be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works,* I propose that you all agree to unite on those Scriptures, with the determination that you will receive heartily and believe every thing in them and practice as they teach in all things. This you can do without any sacrifice of truth or conscience, for you all admit that you believe all that is contained in these Scriptures and that you believe nothing in religion that is not contained in them. Now, I propose that you all believe on Christ, unite on these Scriptures and stand where we, the apostles and the first Christians all stood. All who are in favor of uniting on this ground, will please hold up the hand." *Forty-nine* can go for this, without any sacrifice of truth or conscience, and only *one* can not. The Romanists can not, without rejecting their unwritten traditions. Here is the only possible union ground for the people of God. This ground is possible, and there is not a man living who can offer a reasonable objection to it.

Some man explains as follows: "Our creed is the same as Scripture. We took it all from the Bible." Then the way is clear for you to unite on the Bible, for if you took all your creed out of the Bible, you will find it all in the Bible, and you will lose nothing of truth or conscience.

Some other man explains a little different from the one just alluded to. He says, "Our creed was not, word for word, taken from the Bible, but it is like the Bible—the same in substance." If that is so, your way is clear for

uniting on the Bible, for if your "creed is like the Bible—the same in substance," the Bible will answer the purpose as well as your creed. The Bible will certainly do as well as a creed like the Bible. You can unite on the Bible without any sacrifice of truth or conscience.

The matter rests here: If a creed contains more than the Bible, it contains too much, and whatever it contains more than the Bible is objectionable, and it is to be rejected because it contains *too much*. If a creed contains less than the Bible, it contains too little, and wherein it contains less than the Bible, it is wrong, and the creed is rejected because it contains too little. If a creed differs from the Bible, it is wrong where it differs from the Bible, and is to be rejected because it differs from the Bible. If a creed is like the Bible, it is useless, for, in that case, the Bible will certainly do as well as a creed like the Bible. There is no other ground that a man can take. If he wants a creed, it must be because it contains more than the Bible, because it contains less than the Bible, because it differs from the Bible, or because it is like the Bible. If it contains more than the Bible, whatever it contains more is *an addition to the Bible*. We must not add to the Word of God. If it contains less than the Bible, it *takes from the Bible*. This incurs the displeasure of the Lord. "If any man shall take away from the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." If it differs from the Bible, all know it is wrong where it differs from the Bible, for the Bible is right. If it is like the Bible, it is useless, for we have the Bible.

"What, then, is to be done with all the creeds?" says a man. Do with the whole of them as some of the preachers have done with the Bible—pronounce them "a *dead letter*." There can be no general union till they are abolished, made null and void, entirely abrogated. As long as a single one

of them is in force anywhere, schism will exist. They are subversive of the peace, harmony, coöperation, and fellowship of the people of God in the way of every good work, and subversive of the divine authority. Their influence must be entirely swept away, and the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures restored, not in word, but *in practice*, before the restoration of union among the children of God. They are not the *unwritten* traditions of Rome, but the *written* traditions of Protestants, and it is as indispensable to the success of the cause of Christ, and the peace and harmony of the children of God, that their power be destroyed as it was that the power of the unwritten traditions of the Church of Rome should have been destroyed in the time of Luther.

Why, for illustration, are not the Methodists and Presbyterians united? You reply, "They do not believe alike." They both believe the Bible. Wherein, then, do they not believe alike? The Methodist Discipline is an addition to the Bible, and the Presbyterians do not believe it. The Presbyterian Confession of Faith is an addition to the Word of God, and the Methodists do not believe it. They are not divided about the Bible, for, as stated before, they both believe the Bible. They are agreed about the Bible—that *it is all true.* They disagree about their creeds. Neither party believes the other party's creed. Their difference is not about the Bible nor Christianity. They all believe the Bible and Christianity; but their difference is about their creeds. Methodism and Presbyterianism—things *not in the Bible.*

But now some reasons, in regular order, must be produced for proposing union on the Bible alone:

1. The Church had no creed but the Bible, or the law of God as found in the Bible, during the first three centuries. That it had no creed but the law of God during the

life-time of the apostles, when it had all the grand and sublime sanctions of supernatural power, is equal to divine authority for no creed but the law of God. That its prosperity when it had no creed but the Bible was greater than it has ever been under any creed, is also an argument against all human creeds. That it never had a general division during the period when it had no law but the law of God, is a transcendant argument against all human laws in religion.

2. Wesley said, "Would to God that all party names were forgot, and that we, as humble, loving brethren, might sit down together at the Master's feet, read his Holy Word, imbibe his Spirit, and transcribe his life in our own." The Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist creeds contain the following: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, or may not be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith or thought requisite to salvation." Wesley says in the General Rules for his Societies, and speaking of them, "All of which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, which is the sufficient and the only infallible rule both of our faith and practice." Chillingworth says, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants." The time is now come not only to announce these things as eulogies on the Bible, but to carry them out in practice. These things are all backed up by Paul in the Scripture before quoted. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work." This is an end to the controversy with reasonable people. You can have no more than the man of God perfected and thoroughly furnished for all good works.

3. The Bible-alone ground is not now a mere matter of theory. The thing has been submitted to practice, and, before the heavens and the earth, there is now *actual demonstration.* When the movement was first made, the opposers used to tell its friends that in a few years there would be nothing of it; that it would soon be numbered among the things that were; that the novelty of the movement was the chief attraction; that many persons are always seeking something new. But in many communities in the United States, the movement has been before the world fifty years. The cause has had the trial of time. The result is, that in such communities it is more firmly established than anywhere else. In the section of country where Barton W. Stone first broke the Presbyterian ranks, the cause is as firmly established as anywhere else, and the general sentiment of the people is now on the side of the Bible cause. But Presbyterianism is on the decline there, and has been ever since. At the time the movement was fully inaugurated in Kentucky, the Presbyterians numbered some thirty thousand in that State. They have dwindled down till they now number less than ten thousand, while the Disciples of the Lord have increased till they number probably one hundred thousand. In all the means and resources for operating on the world and moving society, the Christians in that State now stand in advance of all others. This is true of other sections of country, and large sections too. It is true, too, of those sections where the intelligence, the cultivation, and elevation of the country are of the first order.

4. It was argued, at an early period in the movement for union on the Bible, that preachers and private members of such different doctrines and views as exist among the people of this and other countries, were better off separated than they would be united—that such discordant elements

could not be brought together and harmonized. But this reasoning was all short-sighted and fallacious. It proceeded on the assumption that they were to remain partisans, to love partyism, cherish party spirit and feeling. They did not understand that the very first thing was to cure a man of that—to destroy all that party feeling in his soul, and plant, in its stead, the love of Christ, of union, harmony, and fellowship. They have lived long enough now, in many instances, to see actual demonstration. They now see the preachers from different orders coming, uniting, and harmoniously working together. They see the private members coming from all parties and uniting on the Bible, falling in with the utmost harmony. Thousands who have thus been gathered are now on every Lord's day seated together at the Lord's table and commemorating the Lord's death as if they had always been one. Many of these have thus traveled the road together till they have grown old and are waiting for their departure. They have demonstrated the possibility of union on the Bible by an actual *union*, not for an hour, a day, a week, or a year, but *forever*.

"We are all getting on very well if you would let us alone," says a man. Suppose you look over the ground once in your life and see how well you are getting on. In the country towns and villages, numbering from one to ten thousand inhabitants, they average from five to ten churches, or that many parties. They then need from five to ten meeting-houses. If they were united they would only need from one to two meeting-houses. Here, then, at the outset, four-fifths of the money spent in building meeting-houses is wasted, or worse than wasted—given to maintain these divisions. This is wasting the Lord's money for which, as his stewards, we shall give an account. But this is only the beginning. Instead of from one to two preach-

ers in each of these towns, which would be all they would need if they were all united, they now need from five to ten. Here four-fifths of the money given to sustain preachers is thrown away, or worse, given to sustain partyism. Then four-fifths of all the expense of furniture, fuel, lights, etc., in running these establishments, is also wasted in maintaining these divisions. Then, when you have all this expense, instead of these parties laboring to turn sinners to the Lord, the general effort all round is to convert people to *our party*. Sensible men of the world listen to their general Babel, their confusion of tongues, crying "Lo! here, and lo! there," and turn away in disgust into unbelief. The Lord saw all this when he prayed that they *might be one, that the world might believe.*

But you say "we are all getting along well enough if we were let alone." But please look again. A preacher was once invited to a house. Entering the apartment, the gentleman of the house introduced the preacher to his wife. As the preacher took the lady by the hand, he inquired of the gentleman, "Is your good wife a member of any church?" He replied that she was, naming the church, and at the same time pointing in the direction of the meeting-house. "And," continued the preacher, "are you a member of church?" He replied that he was, naming the church, and pointing toward the meeting-house, but in an opposite direction from the house where his wife attended. He was then introduced to two daughters, and, on inquiry, learned that they belonged to another church. On being introduced to two sons, and, inquiring, he learned that one of them belonged to still a different church from any of the others, and that the other one did not believe any of it, nor the Bible. Look at this family when the Lord's day comes. The husband starts in one direction, the wife in another, the daughters in a third direction, and one son in

a fourth direction, and the other son goes to no church, but reads Tom Paine's infidel book, falsely styled the "Age of Reason." Do you call this "getting along well enough?"

But the preacher inquired of this man, "How do you get along in this condition of things?" Drawing a long breath he replied, "Tolerably well." Said the preacher, "How?" "Well," said the gentleman, "I belonged to my church when we married, and when my wife went over here and joined her church, it hurt my feelings very much, and I determined to talk to her, but on attempting to do so, I soon found that we would hurt each other's feelings, and we agreed to disagree and say no more about it." He also gave a similar history about his daughters and his son. The preacher then said to him, "I presume you never commune with your own wife." He replied, "I never did." The preacher continued, "You do not then fellowship your own wife?" This was hard, but, clearing up his voice, he answered faintly, "No, sir." Turning to the wife the preacher said, "And you, madam, do not fellowship your own husband?" She said she did not. The preacher continued to the husband, "Do you not think your wife is a Christian?" "I do," said he, seeming to find much relief in saying it. "And do you not, madam, believe your husband is a Christian?" "I certainly do," said she. "Then," pressingly inquired the preacher, "why did you never commune together?" The husband replied, "It is contrary to the rules of our church." "Who made these "rules of our church?" inquired the preacher. "Our great and good men," was the reply. "Great and good men," said the preacher, "made rules of our church forbidding the Christian husband and Christian wife to commune together! God joined together this Christian husband and Christian wife, and said, 'Let not man put them asunder,' but these 'rules of our church,' made by uninspired men, have come

in and put them asunder in the kingdom of God, where they should be more completely one than anywhere else! From this day forward I will put forth every power of my soul and body to abolish all these uninspired rules, and blot them out forever." On what ground does this family propose to get along agreeably? Simply on the ground of keeping their lips sealed and saying nothing about religion. Never was the great enemy of God and man better pleased than when he succeeded in closing the lips of this whole family and excluding all talk about the name of Jesus Christ and the kingdom of God.

"How are we to obviate the difficulty?" some one inquires. As in the following case: A preacher was invited to a house where the husband belonged to one church and the wife to another. Being seated in the parlor, the husband and wife near by, the preacher was trying to say a few words to interest a sweet little daughter of theirs of six or seven years. It came into his mind that he might turn it to some practical account, and he inquired of the child, "When you grow up to be a woman, do you intend to join your mother's church?" The child looked toward her father with deep concern, but made no reply. He then inquired, "Do you intend to join your father's church?" The child showed more feeling, but made no answer, looking toward her mother. He then pressed in another form: "Which church do you intend to join, your father's or your mother's?" The child stood with its eyes filled with tears, but made no answer. The preacher then appealed to the father and mother to tell why the child did not answer, but they made no reply. The reason it did not answer was obvious. If it joined its mother's church, it had to leave its father. If it joined its father's church, it had to leave its mother. It would not entertain the idea of doing either. The preacher then made his appeal to the father and mother:

"Do you intend to keep this stumbling-block in the way of your child, and thus keep it out of the Church, or will you not unite on the Bible and remove it out of the way?" In an evening or two after, when an invitation was given, the husband walked into the partition in the pews and beckoned to the wife to come to him. She instantly came, and he extended his hand and said, "I have come to offer you my hand to unite on the Bible." She did not wait more than a moment till she took his hand and said, "The Lord helping me, I will go with you." They immediately came forward and united on the Bible. The daughter can now go with both father and mother, and, above all, according to the will of God. Here is the ground on which all Christians can unite without any sacrifice of truth or conscience. There is not a reason in the world why every husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, may not come on the same ground.

"You are too exclusive, talking about the Bible as if nobody else had a right to it." That is not the style of Christians. The Bible is for you as much as for any body, and the argument is to induce you to adopt it, and avail yourself of all the blessings and advantages contained in it. They are for you, and you should not deprive yourself of that which the Lord intended for you and cut yourselves off from it. When you unite on the Bible, that does not deprive any other man from uniting on it. This is the highest ground a man can take. No man can go above it, nor beyond it. To go back to the apostles and first Christians, receive the Gospel, the whole Gospel, and nothing but the Gospel; believe it with all the heart, follow its holy teaching faithfully and honestly in all things, is the highest ground man can take, the best that can be done. The effort to do this is simply an effort to return to the Lord, take him as the great leader in all things, learn of him, and make the

best effort in the power of honest men and women to do his will in all things. Ask them what they are, and they reply, Christians, disciples of Christ. To what church do you belong? The Church of God, or body of Christ. What creed have you? The law of God. Who is the founder of your church? The Lord is the founder of *his* Church, of which all Christians are members. Who is your leader? The Lord from heaven.

There is no getting above this ground. If a man leaves it, he leaves God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the saints, the Bible, the Church of God, and leaves off being a Christian. He becomes an apostate.

The precise thing for the people of God to do is to keep our Lord before the people, his Gospel and teaching, his cause and kingdom, and nothing else. The issue is not about men, nor about the teaching of men, but about Christ, his Gospel and teaching. Those who are for Christ, his Gospel and teaching, his cause and kingdom, and nothing else, are to stand out and make themselves known. They are on the one side, and form the one army. Those for any thing else, no matter what, with all those who are indifferent, or for nothing, are on the other side, in one awful, confused, and motley group, under the one leader, "that old serpent, the devil and Satan," arrayed against the "right way of the Lord." On their side there is no scruple about means and appliances. They are for any thing that will militate against the government of God, the union of saints, and the salvation of man. The cause of the army of the Lord, the redeemed hosts of the true Israel of God, is the cause of righteousness, and no means but righteous means can be employed. The work the Lord has now committed to the hands of his people is a great work. The responsibility is on them. They must see to it that their work is done, and well done.

Let every saint be true to the Lord and his cause, and ultimately receive the crown of righteousness that fades not away. O, that they all may be one! that the world may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God!

SERMON. No. XIV.

THEME.—A NEW TESTAMENT EXAMPLE OF CONVERSION.

COMMENCING Acts viii: 26, a report is found of the conversion of the distinguished officer of state, the treasurer of Queen Candace. The title given to this book, in the common version of the New Testament, is incorrect. It is not *the* Acts of *the* Apostles, but only *some* acts, or transactions, of *some* apostles. Even "Acts of Apostles" imparts but feebly what is contained in it. This book is a history, by Luke, an evangelist of the Christ, of the election of Matthias to supply the vacancy occasioned by the apostasy and fall of Judas; the descent of the Holy Spirit; the endowment of the apostles with supernatural power, to guide them into all truth, in performing the great work of their mission; the first preaching, conversions, founding churches, setting them in order, visiting and encouraging them. In this book are found brief reports of preaching of apostles and first evangelists; and, from these reports, in a goodly degree, we were to learn *what* was preached, and *how* to preach. When these reports are taken together and summed up, the amount of apostolic preaching is found in them. The length and breadth, the height and depth, of what is found here is what is to be preached now to convert and save sinners To these reports the man who wants to know *what* to

preach and how to preach must go. To these reports the man who wants to know *what* the apostles preached and *how* they preached must go. To these reports of apostolic and evangelical preaching, and conversions under that preaching, must men go to learn how men and women were converted. Here must they go to ascertain precisely what was preached to sinners, what effect it had on them, what they believed, what they were commanded to do, what it was to be done for, and what the Lord would do for them.

Here is the divine pattern for all preaching, in matter and manner, the pattern of all conversions, the example that occurred under the eyes of the apostles, with their direction and sanction. The preacher who is free, and has no purpose only to preach the Gospel precisely as it was preached at the first, and maintain it, will examine all the preaching reported in Acts, in all its parts, and maintain it. He does not have to inquire what this man or that man says, but continually inquires *what the Lord says, what the apostles say, and what they did.* With him that is *authority.* The examples, of which he finds record in Acts of Apostles, are *divine precedents with him.* Every item he finds here he treasures up. What was preached once must be preached all the time. What men and women believed at that time, and in one instance, must be believed in every instance and at any other time. What they had to do in any one instance to become Christians had to be done in all instances.

The preacher bound up in some human system, so that he can not plant himself on the Lord's commission to his apostles, and follow the apostles as they went forth under that commission, learn and re-preach precisely what they preached, and who can not, when sinners inquire "What shall we do?" give the precise answer given by the apostles

when the same question was propounded to them, in the same words, is not a *free man*, but is in *spiritual bondage*. It is, nevertheless, a lamentable truth, that a large proportion of the religious teachers of these times are thus bound up. There is but one body of people in this country among whom the preacher of the Gospel can stand up boldly, plant himself squarely on the commission which the Lord gave to the apostles, declare openly and independently that he will follow the apostles and preach precisely what they preached in all things—that men and women must now believe precisely what persons believed in the time of the apostles, do the same things and for the same purpose, in order to become Christians or to be saved, and when they come to the question "What shall we do?" give the answer in the precise words of the apostle. How a man must feel straightened when he preaches to sinners till they are penitent and cry out "What must we do?" and is so tied up and bound that he dare not give an answer to this vital question in the very words of the inspired apostle and maintain that it is right! Yet thousands of men are thus tied up in spiritual bondage, and some of these think they are considerable men and *free*, but they never knew what it was to draw one free and spiritual breath.

In all kindness and with the utmost good feeling, permit an example or two to be introduced. Let a Baptist preacher take for his text the last commission given to the apostles, and tell his audience that he will, by the blessing of God, follow the apostles as they proceeded under that commission. Suppose him to follow up to the sermon of Peter on Pentecost, proceed honestly and faithfully to present every thing contained in the discourse of Peter, and, at the close, some in his audience cry out "What shall we do?" and he honestly and fairly proceeds, in the

very language of the inspired apostle, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Suppose he would thus proceed on through Acts, and present what was preached in every case, and the inspired answer, how long would he be received as a *sound* Baptist preacher? Not a month. The same is true in the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, and every other church, except the one before alluded to. That "one body," "the body of Christ," requires a man to plant himself on our Lord's commission, follow the apostles, preach precisely what the apostles preached, and *nothing else.* When sinners inquire what they shall do, that body requires the precise words in answer to that inquiry to be given, and *nothing else.* It requires the "right way of the Lord" to be set forth, and no other, and requires the converts to walk in it.

It is delightful to stand in the "one body," looking to the one great Head of the Church, then, with no human system in the way, nor fear of man, when about to give the example reported, commencing Acts viii: 26. The points to be considered in the investigation of this case are the following:

1. What did the angel of the Lord do in the case?
2. What did the Holy Spirit do in the case?
3. What did the preacher of Jesus do?
4. What did the officer do himself?
5. What did God do for him?

These are all plain matters of inquiry, and the young men and women should be able to explain them to the children in the Sunday-school, as parents should to their children at home. But several things should be observed before proceeding with the examination, such as the following: 1. If there shall be any thing found in this case, on

careful examination, not agreeing with any man's views or practice now, no one here is to blame for it. This case occurred before any one of this generation came into the world. Any one, then, differing from what is found in this case, must make his objection to the record made by Luke, or to the manner in which Philip the evangelist transacted his part, and not to any one now living. 2. The case is taken, in this discourse, as it is found on the sacred record, and *assumed to be right.* Therefore, no effort is here made to prove any part of the transaction to be right, but the case is taken as an *authoritative* example, so far as the conversion is concerned.

1. What did the angel of the Lord do? He did not *directly* do any thing to the man to be converted. He did not go to the man to be converted, nor did he preach to him the Gospel; nor yet did he appear to him in a dream, a voice, some mysterious sight or sound. What, then? Why not go to him and preach the Gospel? The Lord did not call nor send angels to preach the Gospel, but committed that work to men. He ordained that *men* should be instrumental in saving *men.* The angel went to the preacher —to Philip, an evangelist—and had but a brief message for him. He simply said to him, "Rise, and go toward the south, to the way that goes down from Jerusalem to Gaza, which is desert." This was the sum of the angel's mission in the case, so far as the record informs us. There is, too, something beautiful in the simple-hearted obedience of this ancient preacher. There were several points which preachers generally want some light on, left entirely in the dark, after the angel had delivered his entire message. Such points as the following would occupy the mind of most preachers to some extent: Why send me down a way that is *desert?* Why not send me to some populous town, large city, and into the midst of the people? Then, there was no

light on another subject that sometimes comes into the minds of preachers. There was no light about the *pay*, who will foot the bill, pay the expenses of the tour, and the laborer for work done. On these points there was no light. Then there was no instruction what was to be done down that way. The Lord assumes absolute authority over his servant, and orders him to the spot where he has use for him, without informing him what he is to do. The servant of the Lord has to take it for granted that his Master understands his business, will order him to the right place, and find the work for him. He, therefore, gives him the order to go. There is no intimation of his hesitating a moment, asking a question, or, in any way, taking any concern on himself about what was to be done, or the consequences. "He rose and went." This is an example of most *implicit obedience* on the part of the preacher. This ends all the angel had to do with the matter. When his work was done, the man to be converted was not touched. Not an impression is made on him. He put the preacher in the way leading to the work to be done.

2. What did the Spirit do? He did not enter the man to be converted, go to him, preach to him, immediately impress him, change his heart, or convert him. He did not impress the man to be converted in a dream, in a strange noise or sight. Immediately, he did nothing to him in the way of regenerating him, or any thing of the kind. What, then, was his part of the work? As the officer approaches in his chariot, reading the prophetic Scriptures—the preacher, up to this point, not knowing that he is to have any thing to do with the officer, or that he had reached his divinely-intended work—the Spirit of the Lord said to Philip, "Join yourself to this chariot." This was an influence of the Spirit not easily mistaken. It was in open day. It was not an intangible and unintelligible operation that

took effect in the flesh, and reached the understanding through the sense of *feeling*, but an intelligible utterance, in clear words, distinctly heard, understood, remembered, reported and incorporated in Luke's narrative, entitled Acts of Apostles. It impressed him that he should join the chariot, or, in modern style, made him *feel* like joining the chariot; but the feeling came from the knowledge of the requirement to join the chariot, but the knowledge of the requirement did not come from the feeling. The requirement came to the understanding embodied in intelligible words, and the feeling followed, resulting from the knowledge. This was the part directly performed by the Spirit, not on the man to be converted, but in bringing his conversion about. His part of the work was like that of the angel, not in changing the officer's heart, taking away his sins, or preaching the Gospel to him, but in bringing the man, whom the Lord had sent to preach to him, in contact with him. This the Spirit did *by words*.

3. What did the preacher do? Before this matter is attended to, a curiosity, a strange thing demands attention. An officer of state, in great authority, having charge of the treasure of the Queen Candace, as he journeys, is seen reading the Scriptures! Though this occurred eighteen centuries back, it has novelty about it to any one of our time. What! you are ready to inquire, an officer of state, of immense power and distinction, reading the Scriptures? That is not the kind of reading indulged in by officers of state now. They glance over the political news, then pass over some cunningly-devised and artfully-conceived tale of love of disappointment or triumph, of achievement or failure. True, there are some honorable exceptions, but they are the *exceptions*, not the *rule*. This man was not only reading the Scriptures, but the most appropriate scripture in the holy volume for him, the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

Shall it be said that he was *accidentally* reading this scripture, or was it not *providential?* At any rate, he was reading the following most graphic prophetic description: "Surely he has borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was on him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before the shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand." This wonderful description, written seven hundred and fifty years before its fulfillment, is almost as graphic and full as the historical account of the same matters given by Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John. As Philip approached him and found him reading this prophecy, he said to him, "Do you understand what you are reading?" He replied, "How can I understand unless some man guide me?" He invited the preacher to a seat with him, which was accepted, and the chariot moved on.

This preacher was emphatically a *Gospel* preacher. Had he been of the type of some, getting into company with a distinguished officer of state, he would have taken the op-

portunity to have shown that he, too, was posted and deeply interested in matters of state, and they would have had a fine discussion of the civil affairs of the world. The officer would have seen that the preacher was more under the influence of the kingdoms of this world than the kingdom of God; of the flesh than of the Spirit. But the preacher sent of God was not of that kind. He was a *preacher of Jesus*, and his soul was full of love to God and to his race. He had a divine mission, loved it, and did not forget it when an opportunity was afforded to do the work of his Divine Master. He immediately proceeded with his grand work without waiting for meeting-house, pulpit, or a great audience; nor did he wait to *prepare* a sermon, to *write it out*, or *read it*, but "begun at the same scripture, and preached to him Jesus." He did not preach to him his opinion about Jesus, his views about Jesus, or the views of his brethren, but *preached to him Jesus*. How was that done? It was done as Moses was read. Reading Moses was reading the writings or the law of Moses. Preaching Jesus is preaching the Gospel, or the good news of Jesus. It is not preaching some man's opinion of the Gospel, nor proving some man's opinion by the Gospel, or some creed, doctrine, or commandment of men, nor preaching *about* the Gospel, but preaching *the Gospel itself*—nothing else. It is complete in itself, the thing to be preached, the wisdom of God and the power of God.

This was the theme the preacher had in his heart, and the theme that dwelt on his lips, as he discoursed to the officer of the Queen Candace. He opened and begun at the scripture the officer was reading, and showed him, no doubt, that the language of the prophet referred to had its fulfillment in Jesus of Nazareth, and the transactions connected with his trial and crucifixion recently in Jerusalem. He had no modern doctrines to preach nor prove. All he had

to do was to bring his Lord before the officer and convince him that he was the promised Messiah—that he had come and fulfilled the prediction of the prophet. This work he did.

4. What did the officer do? He did not say he could not do any thing, nor did the preacher tell him that he could do nothing. The only way to ascertain correctly all about it is to follow the record carefully. The historian says: "As they went on their way, they came to a certain water: and the officer said, See, here is water: what hinders my being immersed?" This is an important inquiry. It opens the way for looking round in many directions. No man of intelligence can avoid thinking what would have been the reply if some preacher of the present time had been there instead of Philip. One sort would have brought him before a church to tell an experience, and give evidence that his sins were pardoned and he had obtained a hope, before he could have been immersed. Another class would have proposed to put him on six months' trial, and, if he proved faithful and "got religion," he could then be "baptized by immersion" if he desired it. But the unsophisticated Philip knew no such supplements, amendments, or improvements on the Lord's method of justification, but proceeded in a way divinely adapted to man, saying, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." When the officer heard this, without hesitation, he told Philip what he believed. Said he, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

Do you say "It is a great matter to believe with *all the heart.*" It certainly is, and no other kind of belief is of any value. "I thought you made a *bare assent* of the mind, faith, and all the faith required," says one. In that you have been misled by misrepresentations and false statements. No man of intelligence ever taught that the Lord

would receive any person to the ordinance of immersion, or to himself in any way, on the bare *assent of the mind.* The requirement of the Lord is to believe with *all the heart.* But what is the meaning of that? It is the cordial, free, full, and cheerful assent to the grand proposition, that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." It is like this: You are in distress. A small amount of money will relieve you. You see two men of your acquaintance standing together, and apply to one, asking for the amount required to relieve you. He listens to you, is slow to answer, and finally, but evidently reluctantly, replies, "I suppose I can let you have the amount." You see that it is not free, cordial, nor cheerful—that he would rather not do it, and that if another ounce were on the other end of the scale, he *would not.* That is the bare assent of the mind—no more. But the other man advances toward you, with an earnest look, and says, "Sir, I will let you have the amount you need with *all my heart.*" Who can fail to see the difference? It is no bare assent of the mind in this latter case, but a cordial, free, and cheerful thing. He enters into the act with his heart. It does him good to do it.

How can there be an intelligent human being who can not, on becoming acquainted with the evidence, cordially, most freely and cheerfully, or, which is the same, with the whole heart or affections, believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God? We are in a world of uncertainty, and liable in a single moment to be hurried out of it. Jesus is the soul of the Bible, the center, the grand embodiment of it. On him it all rests. To deny him is to deny it all. He is the light of the world, the way, the truth, and the life. Set him aside, and not one ray of light penetrates beyond the grave. All your friends who passed away from this world are covered in eternal darkness. When you shall sink into the grave, eternal night will brood over you.

Not one ray of light have you, if you reject Jesus, in reference to all that have died. They have gone into an eternal oblivion. Well may you, then, with all your heart or affections, press the faith of Christ to your soul. "If you believe with all your heart, you may." "I believe," replied the officer, "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." On this grand fundamental and sublime statement the man of God received him to the obedience of the faith.

The historian says, "He commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the officer; and he immersed him." Owing to the captious, perverted, and caviling spirit of these times, some things must be noticed here that would not, under other circumstances, demand any attention. Some men, whose business it appears to be to darken counsel, instead of opening the way for the clear light to shine, and who yet claim to be called and sent to preach, have, in numerous instances, said that they could not tell from this history which one baptized the other. To this it may be replied, that if any man has so little mind that he *can not* tell, after making an honest trial, which one baptized the other, he is simply not a subject of religion. Preaching can not do him any good. If any one who can easily see which immersed the other, still tries to blind the weak and ignorant, by saying he can not tell, he is too insincere and uncandid to have any thing to do with any appointment of God. When one man inquires what hinders that he may not be immersed, and another informs him of the terms on which he may be immersed, and the history explains that the terms were complied with on his part, and "he immersed him," and a man persists in saying that he can not tell which one immersed the other, it is useless to waste time in talking with him. A man must have in him a *good* and *honest* heart before he hears the word. The officer inquired, "What hinders that I may not be immersed?"

Philip says, "If you believe with all your heart, you may." He answers, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Giving the attending circumstances, the history says "and he immersed him." There is no such thing as misunderstanding which one immersed the other.

But now attention must be given to the circumstances attending the case, and the peculiarity of the narrative. There is something very peculiar in this little piece of history. The Divine Spirit of all wisdom and all revelation appears to have looked down through eighteen long centuries and seen the little cavilers and caviling of these times, and to have employed such a class of terms and so arranged them as to leave no possible room for mistake. Open your book and look at the passage: "And they came to a certain water." Where does that place them? "To a certain water," or "unto" it, as it is in the common version, is at the water, to the edge of the water. What followed after they were to the water, or at it? The history proceeds: "They went down." In giving a common history, this word "down" is not strictly necessary, for they could not have gone into the water without going *down*. Who went down? "Both Philip and the officer." In a simple narrative the word "both" is not necessary. The word "they," used just before it, included *both*. But after this apparent redundancy, to be still more descriptive, and to put caviling out of the question, he adds the words "Philip and the officer." Why all this particularity? Evidently to put *honest* misunderstanding out of the question entirely. They came to the water first, then went *down into* the water. Does some one say, that "into" only means *to* or *at* the water? That can not be, for they had already come *to* the water, and were *at it*, after which they *went*. *Went* where, after they were to the water, or at it? "They both *went down into* the water." They were already at the water; to

it before they advanced beyond that point, or "both went down into the water." This placed them in advance of where they were—at the water or to it—which advanced position was "down into the water." They were now in the right position for the performance of the act which the Lord commanded.

The commandment was not obeyed when they had gone "down into the water." What they had gone through was preliminary and necessary to the performance of the act commanded. Some little things must be noticed here, seeing that little men sometimes darken counsel with them.

1. It has been said that there was no water of consequence there—not more than a quart or two at the outside. How this precise information is obtained can not be explained here. But one thing is certain, and that is, that Luke's statement is true, that "they both went down into the water;" but they did not *both* go down into a bowl, cup, a quart, or a gallon of water, nor do sensible people think they did. This needs no argument.

2. "But there was no water in the desert." That can not be, for they came to "a certain water." The man who does not believe the narrative needs no baptism, nor is he a fit subject for baptism. It is *faith* that he needs. He must become a *believer* before he has any thing to do with baptism. The atlases teach falsely if there is no water there, for they were in the course of a stream of water more than a hundred miles in length, including its windings. Do you say "It was a water that went dry at some seasons of the year?" No matter if it was. It was not dry at the time the event in question occurred, or they could not have gone "down into the water," nor "come up out of the water," as the history says they did if there had been no water there.

3. "But the apostles could not have immersed three thousand in one day," says an objector. What is to be

argued from that? The assumptions run as follows: 1. That none but preachers could have immersed. This can not be proved, but stands as an unsupported *assumption*, and can not be reasoned from as a settled matter. 2. There were no preachers present but the apostles. This is another unsupported assumption for which there is no proof. A short time before this the Lord had sent out seventy preachers besides the apostles. It is not in argument to be assumed that none of these were present on Pentecost, and reasoned from as a settled point. 3. It is assumed that the apostles could not have immersed the three thousand in the given time. This assumption not only can not be proved, but can be clearly demonstrated to be false. The apostles alone could have immersed the whole three thousand in three hours. 4. It is, then, assumed that, as immersion was impossible, the three thousand must have been sprinkled. But this by no means follows. There is no *sprinkling* in all this. The only thing attempted is to find something opposed to immersion. That is not done; but if it were, there would be nothing in it for sprinkling. There is nothing in all that about sprinkling at all. Sprinkling is entirely out of the question. Independently of all that, sprinkling must be *found and proved.* There is not one word about sprinkling for baptism in the Bible, or in any thing written in the first three centuries.

What was the precise thing done while Philip and the officer were both in the water? In the common version it says "He baptized him." What does that mean? It does not say, he *baptized water on him.* It is a noticeable thing that we never read of baptizing *water.* The element used in baptizing is not the subject of the action, no matter whether it be water, fire, sufferings, or Spirit. We never read of baptizing water, Spirit, fire, or sufferings *on* any person or thing. Where water is the element, and *sprink-*

ling is the action, the water is sprinkled on the subject. The same is true where *pouring* is the action. The Spirit was poured out, but not baptized. The persons were baptized, but not "poured out." Philip did not pour him out, but "baptized him."

Some modern teachers of religion, who draw more on their imaginations than on the authority of Scripture, have discovered, or thought they discovered, that the officer got the idea of being baptized from the expression "so shall he sprinkle many nations," in the last verse of the chapter preceding the one which he was reading. True, in the common version of the Old Testament we find the word "sprinkle," but the officer was not reading the common version, but, in all probability, the Greek Septuagint, which does not contain the Greek word for *sprinkle* in the passage, nor any word meaning *sprinkle*, nor is there any thing about *baptism* in the passage in any translation or the original. It is simply "He shall *astonish* many nations." There is nothing about sprinkling or baptizing in the passage. The officer did not, therefore, find baptism in this reading, unless he found it where it was not, like our modern divines. He learned, in one of two ways, that he must be baptized.

1. He may have learned while in Jerusalem that all who became Christians were baptized.

2. In preaching Jesus, or the Gospel of Jesus, Philip may have preached it to him. No matter in which of these ways he learned it, the information was right.

We find, now, that he went *down into* the water, and, after the act in question, "they *came up out of* the water." What, then, did he do to him when "he baptized him?" This question can not be examined here carefully, but a few things may be set forth in a few words. There would have been no difficulty here had not the word "baptize" been

left untranslated. It is a Greek word, and when it is correctly translated, the thing done is so clearly set forth that no one can misunderstand. It is simply "he immersed him." There is no misunderstanding that. But the mere English reader is ready to say "How shall I know that your statement is correct?" By the following:

1. All admit that "baptize" is a Greek word.

2. There is no translation, no matter by whom made, in which it is rendered *sprinkle* or *pour*.

3. No scholar maintains that *baptize* should be translated *sprinkle* or *pour*.

4. No lexicon in common use defines *baptize* to mean sprinkle or pour.

5. There is not a trace of sprinkling or pouring for baptism in any thing written in the first two centuries, in the Bible or any other book.

6. There is not a more clearly established fact in history than that immersion was invariably practiced for the initiatory rite during the first two centuries.

7. There is not a more clearly established fact in history than that, after sprinkling or pouring came into use in case of weakness or sickness, that it was not regarded as regular baptism; but the subjects of it were not permitted to hold any office in the church.

8. The change from immersion to sprinkling or pouring is clearly admitted in all the authorities of any note.

9. Immersion was invariably practiced by all Christians, except the cases of weakness already alluded to, for the first thirteen hundred years.

10. Luther, Calvin, and Wesley admit that immersion was the original practice. The Romish and Greek Churches admit this.

11. The Greek Church, which has always spoken the Greek language, has immersed from its origin.

12. It makes sense to read immerse for baptize in every instance where it occurs. It does not make sense to read sprinkle or pour.

13. The figurative allusions to baptism, such as "buried with him in baptism," "born of water," "planted together in the likeness of his death," are admitted by all the authorities of any note to refer to the original rite—immersion.

14. Changes from the appointments of God are seldom from the easier to the more difficult, but are almost invariably from the more difficult and unpleasant to that which is easy and pleasant.

15. It is a notorious matter of fact, that but few if any who have been immersed, on a confession of their faith in Christ, ever doubt the validity of their baptism. Those who have received sprinkling for baptism frequently doubt the validity of their baptism, and can not rest till they are immersed.

16. Persons in their last and most solemn moments, in the immediate expectation of death, frequently distrust the validity of their sprinkling or pouring for baptism, but no one has ever been known to distrust the validity of immersion, even in the midst of the solemnities of the approach of death.

There is, therefore, no doubt that when they were in the water *he immersed him.* This is precisely what was done, and this is precisely what the Lord commands to be done now. "Repent and *be immersed* every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ," is the commandment.

What has appeared in the investigation may now be recapitulated, as follows:

1. The part of the work performed by the angel, in bringing about the conversion of the nobleman, was to send the preacher down the way leading from Jerusalem to Gaza.

2. The part of the work performed by the Spirit was to command the preacher to join himself to the chariot.

3. The part of the work performed by the preacher was to preach Jesus to the officer and immerse him.

4. The part performed by the officer was to hear the preaching, believe it, and yield himself to the Lord.

The repentance is not mentioned, but was unquestionably in its place, as he could not have believed "with all the heart" without the repentance. Repentance is present in every case. Not a man ever turns to the Lord without repentance.

5. The fifth and last part to be considered in this discourse, is what *the Lord did for him.* This part, like repentance, is not mentioned in Luke's account, but no one must infer from that circumstance that that part of the work was omitted, or that the Lord did nothing for him From other parts of the holy record it is clearly seen what the parts already found were in order to. He had heard, believed, repented, confessed, and been immersed. He passed through this process in order to justification or pardon. The Lord says, in the great commission, "He who believes and is immersed, shall be saved." This he had done, and thus came to the promise—"shall be saved," or pardoned. In accordance with the promise the Lord granted pardon. This was not something done *in him,* but *in heaven* for him. It was an act of God performed in heaven which freed him from all his past sins. This was one thing done by the Lord for him—*saved him from his sins.*

Another thing done for him was the impartation of the Holy Spirit. The Lord imparted to him the Spirit. This is omitted in the history. It is clearly shown to be the case from other scriptures. The Gospel opened out with the assurance that the Holy Spirit was imparted as widely as pardon was granted: "Repent and be immersed every one

of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and *you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*" This promise stands connected with pardon at the opening of the kingdom, and extends to all who receive remission of sins. This promise was, in his case, as in all other cases, fulfilled when he yielded to the Gospel of the grace of God. He received the Holy Spirit.

What is the last that is seen of him in the sacred record? It is that "he went on his way rejoicing." What was the ground of his joy? Surely there was great reason for joy. When Philip met him, he did not know of whom the prophet was speaking in the scripture he was reading, though the prophet was pointing to the Savior of the world, his humiliation, his pouring out his soul even to death, and making his soul an offering for sin. Now he has the matter explained to him, that the prophet was speaking of the Messiah; that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah; that all that was described by the prophet was fulfilled in him. He believes with all the heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; has repented, confessed his faith, and been immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. He has thus been adopted into the new-born family, received a full, free, and gracious pardon of all past sins, and received the spirit of adoption, whereby he can call God his Father. Instead of the mazes in which he was before Philip preached to him, when he did not know of whom the prophet was speaking—whether of himself or some other man—he now has the clear understanding that he was speaking of the Messiah, of whom all the prophets spoke, who had now come in accordance with the prophecies, lived the life assigned him, died the death, risen from the dead, ascended into heaven, and been crowned Lord of all; that he had sent the Holy Spirit, inspired the apostles, enabled them to preach the Gospel, founded the kingdom of

Church, opened the door, and introduced many thousands into the new and living way—nay, more, that he had received this faith himself, been translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, made an heir of God and joint-heir with Christ. For the first time in his life, he saw that all the light of prophecy had culminated in the Messiah, and that the way to the Father was not only opened, but that he had entered by that way, and was not now simply a son of Abraham according to the flesh, but a son by faith, an heir of God, and a joint-heir with Christ. His sins are to be remembered no more forever. The Spirit of God has now been imparted to him to dwell with him forever. "He went on his way rejoicing," as he had great reason to do, and, no doubt, carried the joyful tidings to his own country.

May we expect all these parts connected with every conversion now? So far as related to what the officer **heard, believed, and did,** and **what the Lord did directly for him,** all may be expected now. No man need wait for an angel to appear to a preacher now, and tell him which road to go to find him and preach to him. This part of the case transpired in the incipient period—the creative period—in which the supernatural was necessary in founding, unfolding, and confirming the new institution. So far as the work of the angel was concerned, it was miraculous, and forms no precedent for any other conversion. It may not be expected, nor necessary, that an angel of the Lord should appear to a preacher and guide him to every man to be converted. So, the Spirit of the Lord speaking to Philip, and commanding him to join himself to the chariot, was miraculous, and not a precedent for every case. The preacher need not now expect to hear the Spirit say, "Join yourself to this chariot." That was a special act for a special case, in the age of miracles, and not a precedent in the general law for all cases. But the hearing of the Gospel, or being in some way brought

to know it, believe it, repent, confess the faith, and be immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—the remission of sins, and the impartation of the Holy Spirit, belong to all cases of conversion alike. Not one of these items can be omitted in any case. They are not each one mentioned, in every case, in the holy record. But while every item mentioned in any one case really exists in every case, whether mentioned or not, no item can ever be omitted mentioned in any one case. For instance, in the reference to the commission made by Mark, he does not give *repentance*. He says, "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." But that does not prove that repentance can be omitted, in any case, in the justification of the sinner. In the words of Paul to the jailer, he said "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Here repentance and immersion both are omitted. That does not prove that they were left out in the case of the jailer, for he "took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was immersed, he and all his, straightway." In the words of Peter, on Pentecost, faith is omitted. He said, "Repent, and be immersed every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." You are not to assume, because faith is not mentioned in this case, that it was omitted, or that they were saved without faith. It was present in their justification and performed its regular part, as it does in every other case. The reason Peter did not command them to believe was that they already believed. He had regard to their position, and commanded them not to do what they had done, but what they had not done—to repent and be immersed. In the words "the like figure whereunto even immersion doth also now save us," neither faith nor repentance is mentioned, yet immersion is nothing to any one without faith and repentance.

The conversion of the Ethiopian treasurer, therefore, in all that pertained strictly to it, was the same as any other conversion, aside from the work of the angel and the Spirit in guiding the preacher to and bringing him in contact with him. Apart from what the angel said and what the Spirit said to Philip, the process was the same as in every other case. The work of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, of the preacher, and of the man himself, was precisely the same as in all other cases. The case forms a divine precedent.

In the examination it will be found:

1. That he heard the same Gospel that is the power of God to salvation to every other person that believes.

2. That he believed the same Gospel that all are required to believe in order to salvation.

3. That he repented the same as all others.

4. That he made the same good confession as others.

5. That he was pardoned the same as all others who become Christians.

6. That the Lord imparted to him the Holy Spirit the same as he did to all others on their becoming obedient to the faith.

7. That he had the same ground for rejoicing as existed in all other cases of turning to God.

What remained for him after his turning to the Lord, was to be faithful till death; to be true and loyal to his new and glorious Sovereign; to fight the good fight; to run the race with patience; to continue in well-doing; seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, in order to the obtaining of eternal life. The Lord is reasonable, and what he has laid down for us, in order to becoming Christians and living to his honor and glory, is clear, easy, and reasonable. If men and women are not saved, it will be their own fault. They are left without excuse, and have no cloak for their sins. Come, then, be persuaded, by all his tender mercies, his love, his

goodness and compassion, by his long-suffering and forbearance, to turn and live. "He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Come, then, to him that loved you and gave himself for you, and live forever and ever.

SERMON, No. XV.

THEME—THE COURSE TO PURSUE TO BE INFALLIBLY SAFE

TEXT—"Enter in at the strait gate."—MATT. vii: 13

IT is a circumstance not to be denied, that immense confusion exists in the public mind touching the way of salvation. No matter whether the cause of this confusion can be pointed out or not, the fact of its existence can not be denied. It is also a fact that many men of good character, fine intelligence, and who are excellent citizens, are standing aloof from all connection with any church, or identification with religion in any form. No doubt, a main cause of this is that a large amount of the preaching is either insipid, lifeless, and powerless *talk*, and nothing more, or wholly unintelligible; so that, on one hand, there is no interest in it, and, on the other hand, they can not understand it. No matter whether the fact can be accounted for or not, it is a fact, and an indisputable fact, that darkness pervades the public mind on the very matter of the highest importance to man of all others—the way to eternal happiness and renown. It is useless to try to blur it over, to disguise or deny it. There stands the stumbling-block before the people. One teaches this way and another that; one says, lo here, and another, lo there. Many stand confounded, and know not which way to go.

Turning to the clear teaching of the Savior, the command

is found: "Enter you in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be who go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." This is a candid and solemn warning, and shows that the Lord saw the narrow way in which his followers would have to walk to gain everlasting life. A speculative man, more interested in some perplexing question than in regard to his own salvation, and, probably, desiring to procure some means of prejudicing the public mind against the Lord's teaching, came to the Savior and said, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" The Lord gave him a more extended answer than he desired. He said: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the Master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are. Then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity." Luke xiii: 24–27. The Lord warned the people to be on their guard; to be careful and not be deceived. You can not determine which is the right way by the multitude walking in a way, for many are walking in the broad road, leading to ruin. An important reason for being cautious that no mistake be made in finding the right way, is that each person is to make but *one trip*. If you were to travel the road many times after missing the way once, you might avoid the mistake next time. But we pass over the way but once, and if we miss it, the mistake can never be corrected. All should make sure work of it, and be certain *not to miss the way*.

In the midst, then, of all the confusion of these times, the different ways held up to the people, as leading to heaven, is there any possible course that a human being can pursue that is infallibly safe? The purpose of this discourse is to give an affirmative answer to this question—to show that *there is a course to pursue that is infallibly safe.* The labor of this discourse will not be to refute those opposed to the positions maintained, but to show an honest and humble person what course to pursue in the midst of all the confusion of the times to be infallibly safe. In order to this end, a few of the most serious difficulties existing will be handled and disposed of in such a way as to show the safe course.

What, then, is the first difficulty to be encountered? It is the difficulty between the infidel and the Christian. A man says: "I have read Hume, Voltaire, Volney, Gibbon, Paine, etc., and you admit that some of these were, at least, men of learning, extended knowledge in antiquity, with vast libraries and time for reading; and they maintain stoutly, and most determinedly, that the Bible is the work of man, and nothing else; that they have no confidence in it. On the other hand, I have read Paley, Watson, Faber, Nelson, Barnes, etc., men of learning, vast knowledge, antiquity, immense libraries, with any amount of time for research, and they say that the Bible contains a revelation from God, and that the man who does not believe it will be condemned. Now, if these great and learned men, on each side, can not decide the matter, settle the question, and put it beyond dispute, how am I ever to decide the matter? If any means were at command by which this difficulty could be made to appear more difficult, such means should be employed, as the intention is to meet the difficulty itself, and not to demolish a man of straw."

Now, do not forget the purpose had in view—to show what course to pursue to *be infallibly safe.* To what danger

is the man exposed who believes the Bible with his whole heart, and honestly practices it, in any conceivable event? To say the least, the man who believes the Bible, and practices its teaching, is as good as the unbeliever. He is certainly as happy. Beyond all dispute, he does as much for his race as the unbeliever. So far as this world is concerned, he is certainly infallibly safe in any possible or conceivable event. Nor does any man doubt that he is infallibly safe so far as the world to come is concerned. Conceive the idea, if you please, that, in the final winding up of human affairs, it were possible for every thing to turn out as the skeptic has argued; the Bible to be entirely of man—as Robert Owen argued, all religion founded in ignorance; to what danger is the man who honestly believed and obeyed the Bible exposed? Conceive the possibility, if you please, for every thing to turn out finally as skeptics have argued, and the Christian to have honestly believed the Bible with his whole heart and practiced it faithfully; to have preached it, written it, published it, and advocated it with all the power in him, through his entire life, and to have opposed infidelity, fought against and done every thing in his power to put it down, to what danger will he stand exposed, living or dying, in this world or that which is to come? No danger of any sort. No man living can show that he has lost any thing that can in any way contribute to greatness, goodness, or happiness in this life, and the skeptic himself will not claim that he has endangered himself in reference to the life to come. No man of any sort, no matter where he stands, nor what he holds, maintains that any great danger can befall a man on account of his believing and practicing the Bible; that he is, on this account, in any sense, not safe for this world and that which is to come, even if all the skeptic claims could, by any conceivable event, prove true. If, in the end, he shall find that all he believed concerning

God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, angels, and men—in one word, all he believed about the Bible—to be true, he will be an eternal gainer; he will have gained all things. But if you conceive the possibility of his being entirely mistaken, and the skeptic right in every particular, he is then as safe as any skeptic on earth, living and dying, in time and eternity. You may confidently defy any skeptic to show that he is not infallibly safe in any event.

But, now, turn round and look at the other side of the question. Let the skeptic prove mistaken, and look to the consequences of his mistake. He finds himself, in the end, standing in opposition to his merciful Creator, who has, in kindness and compassion, put forth his hand to save him; opposed to his gracious Redeemer, who died for him, and to the Bible, intended to guide him to happiness and eternal glory. He believed not the God who created him, and the Lord who gave himself for him. The sentence is, "He who believes not shall be condemned." "He who believes not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." He knows that his skepticism can not possibly make him any better in this life, any more happy; that it can not do the world any possible good; that it has nothing in it to elevate, ennoble, and adorn humanity; that it can not possibly bring any thing great and good to a single soul of the human race; that it can not civilize, educate, or enlighten mankind; in one word, that its whole tendency is to pull down morals, education, and enlightenment in general; and if all it claims could, by any conceivable event, prove true, every believer in the Bible would be as safe in all respects as he for time and eternity! Skepticism is an awful experiment. It is simply taking the risk of losing every thing, without the possibility of gaining any thing for this world or the world to come.

It is like this: A father tells his son that he has ten

thousand dollars to set him out in business; to select a business and he will give him the money. The son goes out, looks around, and comes home delighted; he has found a grand speculation, and calls for the money. The father calls for an explanation of the speculation. The young man sets it forth with much eloquence and fluency. The father listens to him with deep interest, and, when he is through, calls his attention to a certain point in the speculation, and inquires what the result would be should he be mistaken at said point. The young man's countenance falls. He admits that he had not thought of that; that a mistake there would involve the loss of the whole ten thousand dollars. In a few minutes the father calls his attention to many points, at any one of which a single mistake would involve the loss of all his money. His father then turns to the other side and inquires for the result, in case there shall be no mistake, and finds that the best that can possibly be the result, in any event, will be to come out even with the amount with which he started in. "What!" says the father, "a speculation in which there are many chances to lose every thing and no chance to gain any thing! No, sir; you can not have the money." This is the speculation of skeptics. They not only have many chances to lose every thing without any chance to gain any thing, but are certain to lose all, and have no chance to gain any thing in any possible or even conceivable event. Well may skeptics say "It is a leap in the dark." Shall a man of intelligence make such an experiment, take such a risk, when he can be infallibly safe? It is infallibly safe to believe the Bible with the whole heart and practice its teaching. This no man denies. This is indisputable. It would be exceedingly strange if that which is infallibly safe were not infallibly correct.

Why is it that such a large proportion of skeptics, when near the close of their lives, or are in the immediate expec-

tation of death, renounce and repudiate their skepticism? Why does their foundation fail them at the very time when they need support more than at any former period? Why is it that, at the gate of death, so many of them renounce what had been upon their lips for years? Why is it that the most impudent scoffers, bold and ridiculing unbelievers, in such large proportions, when they approach the change of worlds, repudiate, frequently with their last words, the unbelief that had dwelt upon their lips for years? Why does the meekest believer in the kingdom of God press his faith to his heart the more closely as he approaches death? Why is it that not a man who claimed to believe the Bible, while in life and health, ever denied it when he approached death? The answer is, that the divine testimony is sufficient for all confidence, worthy of all acceptation; and the human soul, at the hour of dissolution, when it needs support, leans on that which is infallibly safe, as also infallibly correct.

It matters not, then, whether you can remove all the difficulties skeptics can produce, answer all their questions, or understand all their subtleties or not; they can point the honest believer to no danger to which he is exposed, no serious consequences that can result from his faith in any conceivable event. To believe the Bible, then, and practice its teaching is infallibly safe for this world and the world to come.

Does some man reply that this is no refutation of skepticism? It does not propose to be, but shows you what course to pursue to be infallibly safe, whether you can refute skepticism or not, or even whether you can understand it. It has nothing in it good for you in any conceivable event, whether true or false, and it is useless to trouble your mind about it.

"Well," says a man, "I supposed you could dispose of

the difficulty so far as skepticism is concerned; but I have a difficulty beyond that. My difficulty is among the preachers. For instance, one man says he can prove, clear as holy writ, that all mankind will be finally made holy and happy; quotes Scripture; talks of Latin, Greek, Hebrew; of lexicons, concordances, and exegesis. Another man argues that 'the wicked shall be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God.' I find that there are men of learning and talent on both sides; men of reading and books; and if they can not settle the question, and show who is right, I do not see how I am ever to settle it."

There is not much difficulty in that case. If the man was here who says he can prove so clearly that all will be saved, it would be well to ask him a few questions, such as the following: Do you not admit that all mankind ought to believe the Bible and honestly obey its teaching? He would reply, Certainly I do. Is not the man who believes and obeys the teaching of the Bible as happy as any one in this life? He will answer, Certainly he is the happiest man in this world. Very well; will he not be happy in the world to come? Undoubtedly he will, he will readily reply, for all will be saved in the world to come. Then, being yourself the judge, all who believe the Bible, and obey its teaching, are infallibly safe for this world and that world to come. He will reply, Certainly they are. But what if a man does not happen to believe the Bible and obey its teachings in this life? *He is not safe*, and no argument can make him safe. He stands on doubtful ground, while he might stand on safe ground. He takes a risk, while he might have a certainty. He admits that all who believe and honestly obey the Bible are safe—infallibly safe. This nobody denies. All men can, then, believe the Bible and obey its teaching, and thus be infallibly safe. Conceive the idea, if you can, that it could

possibly turn out that all men will be saved, the man who believes the Bible and obeys its teaching will be saved. Those who believe the Bible and obey it are infallibly safe in any conceivable event.

"But," says a man, "one preacher says 'God unchangeably foreordains whatever comes to pass,' and that the number of the elect is so definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished;' and another says, Christ died for all, and that all *can* come to Christ and be saved. Now, if those preachers themselves can not settle this matter, and show who is right, how can I ever decide it?" Suppose you never should decide that matter in this life, might you not still be happy for this world and that which is to come? Explaining these intricate matters, while it may be some satisfaction to the curious, will never save one human being It would have been transcendently better for mankind if such subtleties had never been started. Men have gotten much credit from the people for starting, handling, and seeming to know much of such matters, as men of learning, depth of thought, and wonderful genius; but they have, to an alarming extent, confused the world thereby and obstructed the way of salvation. They have involved millions of our race in utter confusion. But now, what is to be done? Is there any clear course that can be pursued to avoid all this? There certainly is; and that course is not to try to settle these intricate questions, nor even thoroughly to understand them. It is much shorter and easier than all that. It is obvious that the apostles preached the Gospel to all wherever they went. They approved those who believed and obeyed, and disapproved those who did not believe. The grounds of condemnation are various. Not more than two need be mentioned now. *Unbelief* is a ground of condemnation: "He who *believes not* shall be condemned." *Disobedience* is mentioned as a ground of

condemation: "The Lord will take vengeance on those who know not God, and *obey* not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The Gospel is, then, the only thing to be preached. It is to be preached to all nations for the obedience of faith. It is infallibly safe to preach the Gospel to all men, for all men to believe it and obey it. In any event this is safe. If it could possibly turn out that "God did unchangeably ordain whatever comes to pass," and that the number of "the elect is so definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished," those who believe the Gospel with all their heart, and obey it, are certainly as safe as any body. It can not possibly make the matter any worse for them to have believed and obeyed the Gospel in any event. They are infallibly safe in their belief and obedience. Even if Calvinism should prove true, and they should turn out non-elect, their condition is by no means worsted by their belief and obedience. This is infallibly safe for all men: to make the best possible effort to *know* and to *do* the will of God. If this is not safe, there is no safety. We must live and die in uncertainty. But it is safe—infallibly safe. The strongest Calvinist admits that it is right to preach the Gospel to all. It is right for all to believe the Gospel. It is right for all to obey the Gospel. There is nobody, who believes that the Bible came from God, that does not admit that it is right to believe and obey its teaching. This is infallibly right, as all admit. That which is infallibly right is, beyond all doubt, infallibly safe.

Another man says: "I have a difficulty beyond all you have mentioned, that I know not how to settle. It is this: One preacher maintains that baptism is essential to salvation; another, equally learned, denies it. If learned preachers, on each side of this question, can not settle it, and thus end the controversy, how am I to decide who

is right?" That may appear puzzling to a man at first thought, but a little reflection will open a clear path to any man who is simply looking for a safe course to pursue. There is much in stopping questions. The teacher who desires to keep the public mind clear, states all his positions and questions with a view to that end. The man who desires to mystify, confuse, and perplex the public mind, frames his questions and takes his position with a view to that end. Now, why should any one discuss the question whether baptism is essential to salvation? Why not discuss the question whether prayer, the communion, or the contribution is essential to salvation? Why discuss the question whether any thing the Lord has commanded is essential? All such questions have their foundation in disloyalty to the divine government. There is a much easier method of investigation than this, and more satisfactory. There is no need of starting the question whether baptism is essential to salvation.

Do you inquire for the simpler and easier way of arriving at something satisfactory and safe? Then start with the inquiry, Is baptism a commandment of God? All parties of any note respond, Certainly it is a commandment. About this there is no dispute of importance. It being admitted that baptism is a commandment of God, the next question is simply this: Is it right to obey the commandment of God? Here, again, there is but one answer. All admit that it is right. Then, the man who is a proper subject, and is baptized, obeys a commandment of God, and does right. Is there any man of any note that does not admit that? So far he is safe. But what if he is not baptized? He, then, does not obey this commandment, and is not thus far safe. But there is no necessity for this. If all agree, as all of any consequence do, that baptism is a commandment of God, it is infallibly right to be baptized; and, if infallibly right,

beyond all doubt infallibly safe. This is all a conscientious man wants. He only wants to know what is right and safe, and this is right and infallibly safe.

"But many good people have died without being baptized, and must I believe that they will not be saved, simply because they were not baptized?" says one. No, sir; that is taking unnecessary trouble on yourself. No one says you *must* believe that. Belief is not in what *will not be*. Belief is not negative, but affirmative. Belief is not that something will *not be*, but that something *is*, or *will be*. In certain cases you may lack the evidence that persons will be saved. Where you have not the evidence to believe, you do not believe. It is not the same not to have the evidence to prove that a person will be saved, as to have the evidence to prove that one will be lost. It is not the same not to believe a person will be saved, and believe one will be lost. In the one case you tell what you believe; in the other, you tell what you do not believe. But the matter in hand is not to settle the question of being saved or lost, so as to say with certainty precisely who or how many will be saved or lost. The matter is to determine *what is right*, and *how to do it*. The commandment is baptism, and it is right to obey it. Those who are baptized do right. Those who do right are safe.

But since so much is said about baptism being essential, it may be well to inquire how essential the popular churches in this country make it? The Episcopalian Church makes it so essential, that you can not get into it without what it calls baptism. If the salvation of the Lord is in that church, no one can get that salvation without what the church calls baptism; for, without that, no one can get into the church at all. The same is true of the Presbyterian Church. No one can get into it at all without what it calls baptism. Essential or not, they will not receive a man

without it. There is no Presbyterian salvation without baptism. The same is true of the Methodist Church. There is no "full membership," as the Methodist friends phrase it, without what the church calls baptism. The same is true of the Baptist Church. There is no salvation for any body in the Baptist Church without baptism, for there is no admittance without it—no membership. If the salvation of the Lord is in the Baptist Church, no person can obtain it without baptism. Whatever salvation the Baptist Church has for the human race, or blessings of any sort, baptism is essential to all there is in it. No man can obtain present or future salvation, or any blessing from the Lord in the Baptist Church, without baptism. Baptism is essential to Baptist communion, and to every thing else in the Baptist Church.

How essential, then, is baptism in the kingdom of God! It is so essential that you can not get into the kingdom without it. "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," says the great Head of the Church. The kingdom of God, here, is the Church. "He who believes, and is immersed, shall be saved," says the Lord. "Repent, and be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." "Go, therefore, and disciple all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you." "We are all baptized into one body." Such is a sample of the expressions used in Scripture, sometimes connecting baptism with remission of sins; in one instance with induction "into the name," one instance with induction "into one body," one "into the kingdom of God," and there is also an instance where we read of baptizing into Christ, or induction "into Christ." These expressions

all, in amount, are the same. "Into the name," "into the kingdom," "into Christ," "into one body," and "for the remission of sins," in substance, all amount to the same. If a man is in the name, he is in Christ, in the body, has the remission of sins, is in the Church, in the kingdom. So, if a man is in the kingdom, he is in the body, in Christ, in the name, and is pardoned.

There is not an intimation of any man being in the Church, in the time of the apostles, without baptism. Where is the ground, then, for disputing about baptism being essential? If it is the initiatory rite of the new institution, none were in the first Church without it, and none are admitted into any church now, of any note, without what the Church calls baptism, where is the ground for the dispute about its being essential? There is no ground for this skeptical dispute. All admit that it is a commandment of God, and that it is right to obey the commandment. Then, let all do what they admit to be right, and they will be safe so far as baptism is concerned.

"I have another difficulty about baptism," says a man. "One preacher says nothing but immersion is baptism; another says sprinkling or pouring will do as well—that he would as soon have sprinkling as any thing. I find that there are strong, talented, and learned men on both sides of this question, and if the preachers can not settle it and decide which is right, how am I to determine what to do?" There need be but little dispute about that. Who denies that immersion is valid as the initiatory rite? The whole Romish Church admits not only the validity of immersion, but that it was the original practice. The Greek Church has practiced immersion from the beginning. The Episcopalian Church admits that immersion was the original practice. The Methodist Church has indorsed immersion in its creed, its standard works, and its occasional practice, from

the commencement of its existence. The great historians, John L. Mosheim, Neander, and Wall, admit the validity of immersion, and that it was the original practice. There is not a better authenticated fact in history than that immersion was the invariable practice for the first two centuries, and, from the commencement of sprinkling or pouring in the third century, the invariable practice for the first thirteen hundred years among all Christians, except *clinics*, or persons supposed to be too weak to bear immersion; but, in these cases, they were never permitted to hold any office in the Church, because their baptism was not considered *regular*.

Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and more than three hundred others, whose names appear in the quotations from the learned authorities on this subject, of the most distinguished religious teachers that have appeared in the past three centuries; reformers, critics, commentators, historians, and translators, in one form or other, have committed to writing, and left the testimony, that immersion was the original practice and valid. You will inquire, then, why so many of them sprinkled? They did it, not on the ground that there was any authority in the Bible for sprinkling or pouring, but on the ground that a change in *the form* would not vitiate the ordinance if they retained the *substance*. They admitted the change from the original practice—immersion to sprinkling or pouring—to accommodate the ordinance to supposed cases that might occur in cold countries, or where water would be difficult to obtain, and cases of weakness where they could not bear immersion, arguing only the law of *expediency* for it, but claiming no divine authority for the change. This has been the ground all the time taken by all who practiced sprinkling or pouring at all, till within the past fifty or seventy-five years. More recently a class of men have arisen, less enlightened and far less scrupulous,

who talk about proving sprinkling or pouring by Scripture, and talk of different *modes* of baptism. A few religious adventurers are now found who care nothing for the authority of history, critics, commentators, lexicographers, translators —and, probably, many of them *know* as little as they *care* about these authorities—who deny immersion outright as having any authority in the Bible or anywhere, and utterly refuse to immerse at all. But these are no guide to any body, nor are they to be reached by any weight of authority or argument. They are what they are, because *they are*, and *intend to be*. These irresponsible men are the only exception to the universal proposition, that immersion has been received as valid by all Christians; that it has never been in doubt or dispute. Up to this time there has not been a debate on the simple question, Is immersion baptism? On this question the friends of immersion are ready and willing to affirm all the time. But no man of learning and reputation is willing to deny this in discussion.

The validity of immersion remains unquestioned by any thing deserving the name of authority, and is sanctioned by the weight of all the historians, critics, commentators, lexicographers, translators. No matter what you may think of sprinkling or pouring, there is no question about immersion. It has never been in dispute nor doubt. It remains unquestioned and unquestionable, so far as men of learning and reputation are concerned. Those who receive immersion are satisfied, living and dying. Their minds are at rest about the ordinance. They never hear any preaching that unsettles their minds. Their conscience is at rest so far as baptism is concerned. They have no doubt about it, living or dying. This is not the case with those who have received sprinkling or pouring for baptism. Their conscience is not at rest. Many of them live in continual doubt and perplexity about their baptism. They are continually hearing preach-

ing, or reading books or tracts, such as unsettle their minds and fill them with doubts and confusion. Their preacher visits them, prays with them, talks with them, brings them tracts and books to read, and preaches on baptism. In this way he occasionally pacifies them for the time being, but again they hear some one quoting the admissions of the learned authorities, that immersion was the invariable practice of the original Church; and that "buried in baptism" —Col. ii: 12—and "buried by baptism"—Rom. vi: 4—and immersion comes into the mind in spite of all efforts to keep it out. The mind is again unsettled more than ever. The minds of many of this class are unsettled in death, and they go thus unsettled and in doubts into the presence of God.

What, then, is the safe course to pursue? Undoubtedly, to practice that which never was in doubt; that which never was in dispute among great, good, and pious men. "Go," according to the Scriptures, "to a certain water," where there is "much water," go "down into the water," be "buried in baptism," come "up out of the water," and the controversy is ended so far as you are concerned. Touching this institution, your soul is at rest. This is infallibly safe. No matter what they can prove about sprinkling or pouring, your baptism stands unquestioned and your conscience is at rest. It may be illustrated in this way: You owe a man fifty dollars, and show him a fifty-dollar bill on some private bank, admitting that many to whom you have showed it say it is counterfeit; but you add that you have shown it to others, who say it is good, and they would as soon have it as any. You show him another bill, making similar admissions, at the same time asserting that you would as soon have either as a ten-dollar greenback, and lay this last-named along-side of the others, proposing to the man to take his choice. Do you suppose you would find a

man in fifty miles round green enough to take either of two doubtful bills when one about which there is no doubt is offered? No, sir; in matters of this kind you take nothing doubtful when you can get that which never was in doubt. What would you give for a farm with a doubtful title? No matter if three-fourths of the attorneys in your acquaintance would declare the title good, and only one-fourth declare it doubtful, you would not have it. Use the same good sense in your acts of obedience to God. Do nothing that is doubtful as an act of obedience to the Lord, when you can do that which was never doubtful. If you are aiming to please God, be certain and do that which all of any note admit to be valid, and leave the doubtful. This is infallibly safe. Be immersed on a confession of your faith, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and you will have no more trouble about baptism.

"But there is a difficulty about the operation of the Spirit. The preachers do not agree on this subject; and, if the preachers can not settle this question, how am I ever to decide who is right?" says some one. Could you not be a Christian and be saved if you never do settle that question, or if you never can determine who is right? The operation of the Spirit, whatever it may be and however it may be, is something which you are not to perform yourself. Whatever men may say about it, there is one thing about which there is no dispute, and that is, whatever influence God may please to exercise is from himself and not from man, and he will exercise it, and that, too, whether men understand how he does it or not. No matter whether men understand how the Lord raises the water into the atmosphere, and causes the rain to descend or not. The Lord sends the rain. No theorizing about it, on the part of men, hinders or accelerates the rain. In the same way, no theorizing of men hinders or accelerates the influence of the Spirit. What men must do,

they, of course, must know *how* to do it. That which the Lord does himself, he knows how to do it, and will do it, in his own way, whether men theorize correctly about it or not. Preaching theories about the influence of the Spirit, or the operation of the Spirit, may sound religious to those who do not understand the matter, but there is nothing in it to save a single human being. The thing for man to do is to listen to the word of the Lord, believe it with the whole heart, and do what the Lord commands. This is the best man can do. It is all that he can do. If he believes all the Lord has said, and makes every effort in his power to do all the Lord requires, the Lord will do every thing right on his part. The matter for man to do is to exercise faith in God that he will do his part, in all things, faithfully, whether man can understand how he will do it or not. All should come to God in full assurance of faith, all confidence that he is able and willing to do all things well—to do all for man that he needs—to save his soul. The Lord will do his part whether man understands *how* he will do it or not. It is faith men need—confidence in God that he is able and willing to do for man more than he asks or thinks, whether he understand how the Lord will do it or not. It is not theories about the influence of the Spirit that man needs, but *faith* and *obedience* to the commandments of God. There is no threat against any man because he does not understand any theory about the influence of the Spirit, but there are terrible threats against the *disobedient* and *unbelieving*.

"Some preachers say that justification is by faith only, and others say it is not by faith only. I know not how to decide," says one. What if you never do decide? You know that it is commanded to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." Then, it is clearly right to believe. So far, there is no difficulty. You know that God has commanded all men everywhere to repent. Then, it is right to

repent. So far, the way is clear. Baptism is commanded: "Then Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Then, it is right to be baptized. So far, the way is clear. It is always safe to do what you know to be right. You know it is right to believe with all your heart. You know it is right to repent. You know it is right to be baptized. Do what you know to be right, and you are safe so far as these matters are concerned. Then, if it should turn out that justification is "by faith only," you are safe, for you have the faith. There will be no disappointment, only that you were justified a little sooner than you thought you were. You will certainly not regret that you obeyed the commands to repent and be baptized. But if you should stop at faith, and find that justification is not "by faith only," you would find yourself still not justified. It is, then, infallibly safe to believe, repent, and be immersed. So far, there is no difficulty where the desire is simply to *do right*—to *be safe.*

"But there are so many creeds, all claiming to be right, that I should not know which to take. They were all made by learned men, and if they can not agree on the kind of a creed, how am I to decide which is right?" says one. It is a matter of great moment and of much relief that, aside from all these conflicting, clashing, and erring creeds, there is one book that all parties concede is right. They all agree that the Bible is right—that it came from God. They all further agree that it contains the law of God—that the law of the Lord is perfect. The only wonder is, that man ever attempted to make any other creed or law for the Church. Such an undertaking could not have commenced without two wicked assumptions: 1. That the law of God, as set forth in the Bible, is not sufficient—is a failure. 2. That the insufficiency or failure can be remedied by weak, erring, and uninspired men. No man of intelligence will

affirm, in plain terms, that the Bible is not sufficient for the government of the saints; or that man—uninspired man—can make a creed that will serve a better purpose than the Bible. Still such affirmations are implied in every attempt made by uninspired men to make a creed. If you admit, as all are bound to do, that the law of God is in the Bible; that nothing may be added to it, nothing taken from it, and that no part of it may be changed, there is not an excuse in the world for making another law. The law of God in the Bible is *the law*, the *divine law*, the *supreme law*, in the kingdom of God; and it is a treasonable movement to attempt to get up another constitution, law, name, body, or officers, apart from the constitution, law, name, body, and officers as found in the Bible.

But the matter now in hand is to find a *safe course* to pursue. Can this be done? Certainly it can. All admit the Bible to be right. All admit that the law of God in the Bible is right. All admit that those who follow the Bible honestly and faithfully, in faith and practice, will be saved. All admit that wherever any creed differs from the Bible it is wrong. Then it is infallibly safe to take the Bible and follow it. When men undertake to prove that a human creed is a good one, they argue that it is *like the Bible*. If a creed like the Bible is a good one, why will not the Bible itself do? If the Bible will not serve the purpose—is insufficient and a failure—a creed like it would be equally insufficient. When men make a creed to do what the Bible would not do, they should certainly make it different from the Bible, or it would serve no better purpose than the Bible itself. Why does not some man, who thinks we can not govern the Church with the law of God, come out and show us wherein the law of God is deficient; where the creed should be made different from the law of God, so as to serve the purpose better? No man does this;

but every advocate of a human creed maintains that he took his creed from the Bible; that he can prove it by the Bible, or that it is like the Bible. There are not many positions that are conceivable touching this matter. It might be a source of some satisfaction to look at the positions possible:

1. Did the Lord design the Bible, or his law set forth in it, as the creed—the rule of faith and practice? He certainly did; for the first Christians and the Church had no creed or rule of faith and practice but the instructions found in the sacred writings, the law of God, as now found in the Bible. It is simply a matter of fact, that the first Christians and Church had no guide but the teaching of Christ and the apostles. Then, the apostolic requirement to "preach the word"—to commit the things learned of the apostles to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also; to preach no other Gospel, nor even pervert the Gospel; to add nothing, take away nothing; to continue in the things learned; to hold fast the form of sound words—sound speech, that can not be condemned, shows that the Lord intended us to go to him for the creed, the rule of faith and practice; to adhere to his teaching, as set forth by him and his apostles, and not to be turned away after the commandments of men and the rudiments of the world. The grand statement of Paul, that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works," shows the use that the Lord intended should be made of the Scriptures. They were intended to *perfect* the man of God, and *thoroughly* furnish him for every good work. This leaves no room for any human creed, and no excuse for any man to hanker after one It shows, also, the Lord's design—that he designed the inspired Scriptures to be *the rule* of faith and practice

2. Seeing, now, the Lord's design, to make the inspired Scriptures the rule of faith and practice, has he failed in that design? And shall some man, or set of men, presume to improve on the Lord's design, and accomplish that wherein the Lord failed? This would be presumption added to presumption.

3. But it is a fact, that no human creed existed for about three hundred years after the birth of Christ. During the most successful and triumphant period of the existence of the Church, she had no human creed, but was governed wholly by the law of God. This ought to satisfy all good men.

4. But what is gained when you make a creed? Nothing, only that a foundation is laid for a party. No man nor set of men can make a creed that will give general satisfaction to any considerable number even of the best men in the world. Vast numbers of them will never indorse it, and will never unite with those who hold the creed. Even those who indorse it, every few years will get into contentions about it, and split asunder. Take the Presbyterians as an example. They have a creed with as much human skill, wisdom, and labor bestowed on it as any creed in the world. What has resulted from it? 1. It has barred them from all other denominations. 2. It is not believed nor received by any people in the world except themselves. 3. They have had eight or ten divisions over it. 4. The Old and New School are now divided about the interpretation of the creed. 5. After a struggle of some two hundred years, all the sorts of Presbyterians together in the United States amount to not more than five hundred thousand, or about *one in seventy* of our entire population! The effort to return to apostolic ground and teaching, in all things, in the great reformatory movement of the nineteenth century, has risen up and outnumbered them in fifty

years, in defiance of the combined opposition of all the parties in the land. The same has been illustrated by the Methodist and Baptist creeds, only that they have been more prolific in both numbers and divisions.

5. There is not a human creed in the world that has any popularity in a single party on the face of the earth, except the one that has adopted it. All other religious parties utterly disregard it. The idea of any extended success on a human creed is utterly hopeless. There is nothing clearer than that the parties built on these human platforms are decomposing and crumbling away to nothing. The man bowed down under a human creed, at this late date, with the history of the past three hundred years before him, must be a dull scholar truly.

6. The Bible has the advantage in every respect. All admit that it is from God; that it is right in all respects; that it is perfect in all its parts; that it contains all things that pertain to life and godliness; that it contains the whole will of God to man; that it contains the law of God; that it contains the teaching of Christ and the apostles; the word of God, able to save the soul, to build up the saints, and give them an inheritance among the sanctified; thoroughly furnish them for every good work; that it contains the rule by which all shall be judged in the last day. It has the weight of divine authority in it. It has the power of God in it. It is backed up by the Almighty Father of heaven and earth; by his oath, by the throne, and him who sits on the throne; by the crown and all the armies of the upper world. The men who stand by it defend it, and commit their all to it; are girded as with the everlasting hills, and continually realize that the everlasting arms are underneath. They depend not on their own wisdom, but on the wisdom of God, as set forth in the holy teaching of Scripture; the power of God and the wisdom of God, as dis-

played in the preaching of the cross of Christ. They depend on no teaching of their own, views, nor theories, but on their great Master, the Messiah; his teaching, and that of his apostles; his cause and his work. They have identified themselves with him and his cause, and have lost sight of themselves in beholding the glories of their Lord and Redeemer. They have taken their stand behind their great Leader, the Lord, the King, who sits on the throne in heaven, and intend to keep him in front of them. They have planted themselves squarely on the foundation which the Lord laid, on which the Church was at the first planted, and on the law of the Lord, and intend to stand by their Lord, his cause, all he said and did; to defend and maintain that and nothing else. This, they know, is infallibly safe for this world and that which is to come. They intend to stand by every man, side by side, in full fellowship, who is identified with their Lord and his cause, and push the Bible, the law of the Lord, the teaching of Christ and his apostles, through the world. The Gospel of Christ is their theme. Those for the Gospel of Christ, his teaching, and that of the apostles, and nothing else, will find themselves all united in one cause and one work, under their one great Leader and Commander. The Lord of hosts will be with them.

On the other hand, those on the side of human creeds, if they have not seen enough to satisfy them, will soon see enough. They have no cohesion. They are splitting on every pretext. They are crumbling and falling to pieces on every hand. They are convincing sensible men that they have nothing tangible nor intelligible. They are groping their way in the dark. They can not stand before Bible men. For they admit that the Bible is right; that it is from God; that it is perfect; that their creed is not right, not from God, not perfect. With these admissions, they

can not stand before the Bible and Bible men. They can not maintain their plea for a creed which they admit is not right, not from God, not perfect, in competition with the book which all admit is from God, right, perfect. They can not withstand the men for Christ, his cause, his Gospel, his teaching, and that of his apostles, and nothing else. There is no standing before the Lord and his cause, nor before his word—his Gospel. The men who intend to oppose the friends of Jesus, should be informed what they will have to withstand, so as to enable them to make up the issue and prepare themselves for the contest. It is now in tangible and intelligible form, so that they can understand it. They need not commence isolating scraps from writings among Christians of the present day, or of any day, as exponents of the teaching of Bible men. Many of these scraps might be shown to be all right, if taken in their contextual connection; but whether this can be done in every instance or not, is a matter of no importance. The slips of the pens of good men, the chance erroneous positions taken by them, or mistakes made, are not the teaching, or a fair representation of their effort. No man is bound to defend these. They are not the ground of Bible men. The Gospel, the teaching of the Lord and his apostles, the ground on which the first Christians stood, is the ground, the Gospel, and teaching maintained, advocated, and defended. As one man, the friends of the Lord Jesus stand here, and, by the grace of God, intend to stand here till the last. If it is not safe, then all the Christians for the first three hundred years were not safe, for they all stood here. They believed the Gospel, and became obedient to the faith. They, then, followed the apostles' teaching faithfully, and had the promise of a crown of life. This is infallibly safe for this world and the world to come. May all the friends of the Lord prove themselves worthy of this

ground, defend and maintain it with integrity till the Lord shall come, and thus be able to say, "I have kept the faith." In the Lord, their strength and Redeemer, is their everlasting trust. To his name be the honor and power everlasting.

SERMON, No. XVI.

THEME.—THE LOVE OF GOD TO MAN.

TEXT—"God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes on him should not perish, but have eternal life."—JOHN iii: 16.

THE words just read set forth the most wonderful statement ever uttered, and yet one of the most encouraging to the human race. When we consider that the history of mankind for four thousand years had been but little else than the history of sin and transgression; and that, at the time Jesus came into the world, the race had all gone out of the way—that there were none good—that the whole world had become guilty before God, was concluded in unbelief—all lost; when the corruptions, crimes, and iniquities that constantly were in remembrance before God from all parts of the world, is it not wonderful beyond expression "that God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes on him might not perish, but have everlasting life?" What a wonderful lesson there is contained in this, and with what child-like simplicity the apostle deduces that lesson from it: "If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." 1 John iv: 11.

What an unspeakable satisfaction it is to every human being to know that, however neglected by men, cast off and forsaken; however down-trodden, oppressed, and despised

of men, each one is loved by the Creator and Benefactor of all! When a poor creature is seen degraded, corrupted and cast down, how blessed it is to know that God has loved such an one. When one is friendless and homeless in this world, how rich it is to know that God has loved such an one. However degraded, debased, and despised, every creature of the human race is a subject of the love of God. God loved the world; nay more, he "*so loved* the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes on him might not perish, but have everlasting life!"

In noticing speakers, in their efforts to give expression to their ideas of the lofty origin of the grand scheme of divine benevolence vouchsafed to men, you will hear one assert that it originated in the Infinite Power. That is truly a lofty origin for the Gospel scheme, but it rises not high enough. Another effort is made, and the speaker says it originated in the Infinite Wisdom. That is certainly ascending one step higher in the scale, but is by no means satisfactory. He makes another struggle, and rises another step. He says the glorious plan originated in the Infinite Will: the Lord *willed it*, and it was done. But he makes one more effort, and declares that the grand scheme of human redemption originated in the Infinite Goodness; that the Infinite Goodness originated and suggested it, the Infinite Will resolved it, the Infinite Wisdom devised it, and the Infinite Power executed it.

What an overwhelming thought, that the infinitely pure, holy, and just One, in looking over the debased, degraded, and corrupted children of men—fallen, lost, and in ruins should have had compassion—that the Infinite breast should have been moved with pity for man! What amazing pity, what wonderful compassion, what boundless mercy! He loved the world, was moved with compassion, and resolved:

"I will have mercy on a lost race. I will extend my hand in pity, in infinite compassion, in divine mercy, to save, to lift up, purify, ennoble, happify, and glorify humanity." But when the divine resolve was made to make an offering for sin, where was an offering to be found rich enough to be an exponent of the infinite compassion for man—an offering to expiate the sins of the world? The cattle on a thousand hills would be by far too feeble, too poor, and mean an offering. Such an offering could not take away sin. The gold of the four quarters of the globe could not take away sin. All the landed patrimony of earth, concentrated into one sin-offering, could not expiate one sin, free one soul from death—could not save one lost sinner. Where was a sin-offering to be found rich enough, a victim sufficiently precious to be, at the same time, an expression of the love, the infinite compassion, and that could expiate sin—be the one sin-offering, and purge us forever from our sins?

When men make a sacrifice, they frequently seek something that they can give, as they express it, and "never feel it." But those sacrifices that men make without *feeling it*, are miserably poor and mean sacrifices. They ought to be ashamed of them. Even a Jew selected the *best*, the most *perfect*, and the *richest* gifts for offerings. When the Lord was about to make a sin-offering, where did he find the gift? He looked through his vast dominions, and selected the dearest object, the richest jewel—that which lay nearest to his own bosom—his own dear Son—the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, and gave him—yes, blessed be his name, gave him up freely for us all, that whoever believes on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. How beautifully Paul alludes to this, in his plea for a rich gift for the poor saints: "Know you not the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet, for our sakes, he became poor; that we,

through his poverty, might be made rich." Well, too, does the poet break forth in the following strain:

"Let everlasting thanks be thine
For such a bright display,
As makes the world of darkness shine
With beams of heavenly day.
Oh, for this love, let rocks and hills
Their lasting silence break,
And all harmonious human tongues
Their Savior's praises speak."

But seeing that our Lord became poor that we might be rich, it might be profitable to inquire how poor he became. To this there is a ready answer. He became so poor that, on one occasion, he exclaimed: "The foxes have dens, and the birds have places of repose, but the Son of Man has not where to lay his head." Is there anywhere a murmuring, repining, and complaining disciple of Jesus, lamenting his hard fate, his poverty, his lowly condition? Is there anywhere a poor, weak, and complaining preacher, lamenting over his hard fate, his poor fare, his scanty support? If there is, let him look up and inquire, Is the servant better than his Master? Is the disciple better than his Lord? If the Lord had not where to lay his head, and did not murmur nor complain, why should his followers, for whom, in the general, there is much better provision made, murmur or complain? There are but few preachers now, poorly as they are cared for, and many of them meagerly supported, as well as lacking that hearty encouragement which they should receive, who can honestly say *they* have not where to lay their heads. Many of them are poorly provided with the good things of this world, and some lack the comforts of this life really due them, and very many brethren will find themselves unable to render a just account in the final judgment, on account of withholding

from them their just due. These should be taught to lay up for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life. But this does not by any means justify any man in murmuring, as a follower of Jesus, or a preacher of the Gospel, because he is poor or has a hard lot. The poor men of the kingdom have done, and are doing, to a great extent, as private members and preachers, the main body of the hard work—doing it for a small compensation, and living hard. In doing this, without complaining, they are following their Lord and Master.

What a wonderful thought, that he, who was rich with the Father in heaven, should have become poor, that we, through his poverty, should be made rich! This our Lord did—become so poor that he had not where to lay his head, and that, too, when those whom he came to bless had plenty, and not only would not bestow any thing for his support, but despised and rejected him. What a scene, too, it was for him to look upon, to see his own people, whom he came to save, in the open way to ruin, as they turned away from him, and dashed the cup of salvation from their lips! What a scene for the contemplation of the children of men, to see him, as he stands, looking over the devoted city, and cries, "Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that stonest the prophets, and killest those that are sent to thee; how often would I have gathered your children as a hen gathers her brood, but you would not!" In infinite love he came to save them; to lift them up, and crown them with glory and honor, but they would not have him to reign over them.

The present occasion should not be disturbed by any dry and tough theories, but a bare allusion must be made to one, without attempting to tell how far wrong or how near right it is. The theory in view starts out by contemplating the Father as filled with rage and fury, with an uplifted hand,

ready to smite the earth with a curse. But just as the fatal blow, which was due to man, was about to fall, the most gracious Lord and Savior Jesus Christ stepped in, and the blow that was due to us fell on him. As just stated, it is not the purpose now to try to determine how far this is wrong, nor how near it is right; but one thing is obvious, and that is, that while it presents the Savior as a most benevolent, lovely, and compassionate being, there is nothing in it to lead us to love the Father. The Scripture says, "We love God, because he first loved us." We love the Father, because he gave the Son; and love the Son, because he loved us, and gave himself for us. This leads us to love both the Father and the Son.

Some men have much to say of the love of God and of salvation, who sweep away all ground of the love of God and all idea of salvation. The love of God was in view of man *perishing*. He "so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes on him might not *perish*, but have everlasting *life*." Man was in sin, in danger of perishing, of losing eternal life. The love of God to man was in view of his perishing and failing to obtain eternal life. It was that he might not *perish* but have eternal *life*. The man, therefore, that does not believe that man can perish, that there is any danger of man perishing, or that there is any such thing as man perishing or losing eternal life, has no foundation for the love of God. If man was never lost, in any danger of perishing, of losing eternal life, of losing both soul and body in hell, why should God have loved the world, and what did Jesus accomplish by coming into the world? In that view, what salvation is there? Salvation is *deliverance*. Where there is no deliverance there is no salvation. If man was never lost, never in any danger of perishing, nor of losing his soul—if there is no hell, second death, nor eternal punishment—if the soul

can not be lost in hell; in one word, if there is no danger of any sort, all idea of *salvation is wiped out.* The vaporing of some men about the salvation of all mankind, is the most idle fiction ever dreamed of. Salvation from what? From sin in this world? Certainly not, for they deny that any are saved from sin in this world. From hell after death? Surely not, according to their theory; for there is no hell beyond this life. From the second death? By no means; for with them there is no second death. Where, then, is their salvation or their deliverance? They literally have no salvation from any thing in this world or the world to come—no deliverance from any thing in time or eternity. But the scriptural idea of it is, that man was lost under sin, included in unbelief, and God loved him—so loved him that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes on him might not perish, but have eternal life. Jesus came in divine compassion to save that which was lost—came into the world, that the world through him *might be saved.*

This is the great trouble in preaching in the present day, to induce men to realize that they are sinners; that they are lost, in unbelief, under condemnation, and will finally be lost, soul and body in hell, unless they are united with Christ. If men could be brought to realize their danger of being lost, as they generally do in the immediate expectation of death, what an effort there would be to come to the Savior. The reason preaching does not take more effect is not that men can not understand the Gospel, but they are not sensible of their danger. They are not impressed with the idea that they are guilty before God, condemned and must be pardoned or be lost forever. The reason, too, why there is not more zeal in the preachers and private members of the Church than there is, may be found in the fact that they are not sufficiently impressed with the awful truth that the world is lost, under condemnation, and must perish

forever, unless turned to God. This is really the case whether we realize it or not, and the great matter is for the preacher to keep his soul impressed continually with the awful idea that *it is so.* In doing this he is certain to impress those who hear him with the same overwhelming idea. The man made conscious of the idea that he is lost, guilty, and condemned; that he must finally perish unless he turns to God, will desire salvation and seek the way. Such an one will find the way.

The very circumstance that God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes on him might not perish, but have eternal life, and that our Lord became poor that we, through his poverty, might be rich, should rouse every human being, stir every power within, and cause one general rush to the extended hands of compassion, the offers of mercy, and a most gracious pardon. How can any one be content for a single day; how can any one rest for a moment; how can any one ever slumber till he is reconciled to God, justified or pardoned, after learning that the deplorable condition, the inevitable ruin to which he was rushing, and the awful punishment to which he was exposed, so to speak, moved the great, the infinite and eternal One in compassion, love, and mercy; yes, not only moved, roused, and called forth the infinite compassion, but so wonderfully moved the divine compassion as to call the Lord from heaven to earth to recover man from ruin?

"We love God, because he first loved us." God was manifested in the flesh, so that he who saw Jesus saw the Father in him. As man loves and honors the Son, so he loves and honors the Father. The object now is to turn attention to the Son of God, and inquire into the reasons why we should love him. In his life are these reasons found why we should love him. Let the mind, then, follow

him, examine what he said and did in search of reasons for loving him. How did he act toward objects of pity of compassion and mercy? Follow him, if you please, and notice. Imagine that you see him, followed by a vast multitude, passing along, and, as he passes, you notice a poor blind man sitting by the way. The blind man inquires for the cause of this vast concourse of people, when some one explains to him that "Jesus of Nazareth is passing by." You notice the pitiable object to see what he will do. He lifts his sightless eye-balls, and most imploringly calls out, "Jesus of Nazareth, Son of David, have pity on me." The Lord stops, gives attention to this poor blind man. He who was with the Father before the beginning of time, by whom and for whom were all things, inquires of the pitiable object of mercy, "What will you have?" In the simplicity of a child, and in view of his great calamity, he exclaims, "O that I might receive my sight." In the same moment, and by the same act, the Lord put forth his almighty power, and gave both a demonstration of his benevolence and divinity in giving this poor man sight. For the first time the man looked up and saw the beautiful heavens above him, all nature around him, and, it may be, his own father and mother, sisters and brothers. Had you been there, would you not have been disposed to fall down before him and exclaim, as one did on another occasion, "Lord Jesus have mercy on me, for I am a poor sinful man." He showed that he was the friend of the objects of pity and compassion, and, at the same time, that he possessed infinite power. There is reason to love him, then, both in view of his condescension to the lowly and his demonstration of almighty power.

Please turn attention to another point and view him on another occasion. He was out at sea, on one of those frail vessels anciently used mainly in coasting, in company with

some of his disciples, and they were overtaken in a frightful storm. He was composedly lying on his pillow asleep. When the disciples saw the danger they were greatly frightened, and in much consternation came to him, exclaiming, "Master, behold we perish." Our gracious Lord rose up quietly, deliberately, and without the least trepidation, calmly he walked forward, looked out into the dark and furious heavens and over the foaming sea; gently he lifted his hand, and in mildness said, "Peace, be still." In a few moments all is calm, serene, and secure. Some one, amazed, exclaimed, "Who is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?" Well may he be called "Emanuel," or, when translated, "God with us." Here he demonstrated both his power and willingness to save. How could the disciples, then, with him have failed to love and adore him as their Savior, after such a grand transaction? How can any man now fail to love, adore, and honor him as the chief among all the ten thousands, and altogether lovely?

Please accompany him on another occasion—one more touching and sympathetic. You remember the account of that remnant of a family consisting of Lazarus, Mary, and Martha. The probability is that the father, mother, and, it may be, other brothers and sisters had died, and these were alone. In affection and devotion to each other they cling together. It is now a precious little circle—an only brother and two sisters dwelling quietly and in love together. But suddenly the king of terror forces his way into the little circle and strikes down the last male member of the family. Lazarus is dead! All is solemnity. The heart-broken sisters are in unutterable grief. Their brother is gone! He had now been dead four days. Jesus is passing that way. As he draws near, one of the weeping and heart-broken sisters hastens to meet him, overwhelmed with grief, and exclaims, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had

not died. But I know that even now, whatever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." See John xi: 21, 22. Jesus replied, "Your brother shall rise again." Martha replied, "I know that he shall rise again at the resurrection at the last day." This, however, was not precisely the comfort she desired. She desired that her brother be restored now. "Jesus said to her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believes on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whoever lives and believes on me, shall never die. Do you believe this?" She replied, "Yes, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, who should come into the world." She then hastened and called Mary, and when she was come she fell at his feet and said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." "When Jesus saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping who came with her, he groaned in the Spirit and was troubled," and inquired where they had laid him, and the historian says "Jesus wept." Blessed be his name; he can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. He entered into sympathy with humanity, and was moved by the sorrows and bereavements of the children of men.

"Come," says he, "and show me where you have laid him." They accompany him to the grave of Lazarus, and he commands them to take away the stone from the entrance of the tomb. Martha said, "By this time the body has become offensive." Jesus replied, "Did I not say to you, if you would believe, you should see the glory of God?" He then lifted his eyes and addressed his Father, thanking him that he always heard him, and explaining that because of the people he made the address, that they might believe that the Father had sent him; and, having concluded his address to the Father, he turned and addressed himself to the dead man. Did you ever hear any one address a dead person? Did you ever hear the bereaved and disconsolate

widow address her dead husband as he lay in the coffin? No response is made! Did you ever hear the mother as she addressed her dead child? The child gave no answer. All was still and silent. What appalling gloom! But, thanks to God, when Jesus shall speak to the dead they will respond. "He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." He who was dead came forth, bound hand and foot, with grave-clothes on, and his face bound with a napkin; and Jesus commanded them to loose him and let him go. Thus he demonstrated his benevolence in restoring a brother to his afflicted sisters, and his divinity in raising a man from the dead; showed his love to all mankind, and his power to raise the dead. What an unbounded relief to the soul, to know that we have a friend, a Savior, who is able and willing to make the dead alive. "As I live, you shall also live," says "he who was dead and is alive, and lives forever and ever."

Please accompany the Savior at another point. Imagine you see him late in the evening, accompanied by Peter, James, and John, on his way to the garden of Gethsemane. They walk along quietly and silently. The disciples are guided by him, but know not where they are going nor what is to be done. He was accustomed to retire to the solitude for devotions. It is said of him, in one instance, that he prayed all night. He so frequently drew aside from the multitude for prayer, for composure, and an opportunity for imparting private instructions, that they had no need of any surprise at his drawing aside at this time nor in this manner. No new interest appears to have been excited in them by the movement. They passed along their quiet way, entered the garden, and after walking a short distance he turned to them and said, "You stay here and watch, while I go yonder and pray." His soul was heavy. He was exceeding sorrowful. Advancing a few paces he fell

down on his face and prayed: "O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me! Nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." Who can repeat this language with a due appreciation of what is contained in it? This was prayer in the true sense—prayer indeed. He had the cross in view, with all the shame and mockery accompanying, with his wonderful sufferings. He had a sinful world on his soul. Rising up he returned and found the men whom he commanded to watch, asleep. How mortifying in this hour of trial, when his soul was bowed down in grief, that these men, whom he had specially called and who had accompanied him for about three and a half years, should have been so little interested in and impressed by the great matters in hand, that they had, in a few moments when he stepped aside from them, fallen asleep. But they had misunderstood him all the time, had no realization of all that was at hand, nor expectation of what was soon to occur. "What!" said he, "could you not watch with me one hour?"

After rebuking them, with all the wonderful matters soon to transpire in Jerusalem on his soul, he returned, and, falling down, prayed the same words again: "O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me! Nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." Rising again he found them asleep the second time, and rebuked them. How hard that they should have fallen asleep while he was in the midst of these terrible agonies! Returning again he prayed the same words: "O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me! Nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." In his terrible agony his sweat became as great drops of blood. How great was his love! How wonderful the agony of mind, his trouble in spirit! In view of this scene, let no saint fear that his zeal, solicitude, and anxiety are too great, that his prayers are too fervent, that

he has too vivid and lively an appreciation of the great cause in which he is engaged in striving to save man. What everlasting obligations we are under to love, adore, and honor the Savior of men!

Returning to the disciples, he found them sleeping the third time, and told them to sleep on now, and take their rest. No wonder that poor, weak, and care-worn men and women should fall asleep now, under the best efforts men can make in preaching the Gospel, if they could not have kept awake on that night. But their rest was not permitted to last long. Soon he says, "Let us be going." He knows what they are to meet. Often had he crossed the Cedron to this garden, and Judas, who betrayed him, knew the place; and, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, came, with lanterns, torches, and weapons. Jesus knew all these things; went out, met them, and inquired, "Whom do you seek?" They replied, "Jesus of Nazareth." He answered them, "I am he."

How bold and independent! No evasion, no apology, nor expression of surprise. Judas, who betrayed him, was there with them. When the Lord answered "I am he," they went backward, and fell to the ground. Then he inquired again of them, "Whom do you seek?" They replied, "Jesus of Nazareth." Again he said, "I am he." Peter, who was standing by, with all his ideas of an earthly kingdom in his mind, resolute, and determined to fight for his Master, instantly drew his sword, struck the high priest's servant, and cut off his ear. The Lord then turned to Peter, and commanded him to put up his sword, adding, "The cup which my Father has given me, shall I not drink it?" "Then the band, the captain, and officers of the Jews, took Jesus, bound him," and led him away. Peter and John followed him, witnessing all that was done; but, seeing their Master

under arrest, and in the hands of his enemies, their courage failed them.

The high priest asked Jesus concerning his disciples and his teaching. The Lord replied, "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple, where the Jews always resort, and in secret have I said nothing. Why do you ask me? Ask them who heard me what I have said to them; behold, they know what I said." An officer who stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, adding, "Do you thus answer the high priest?" What an indignity! How mildly and meekly it was endured! He calmly replied, "If I have spoken evil, bear testimony of the evil; but if well, why do you strike me?" During the trial, and when he needed a friend more than he had ever done before, Peter had been given over to Satan to be sifted, and denied him three times. What a scene was here for men and angels to witness! The only absolutely pure, perfect, and sinless inhabitant this world has ever had, was arrested, and brought before the civil court, and tried for his life. After a calm and impartial examination of the case, their judge said, "I find in him no fault at all," or, as they express it in the civil courts now, "I find him not guilty." What a picture! He, who knew all things, had power to call twelve legions of angels to his relief, stood in the court; permitted himself to be treated as a criminal; made no effort to escape condemnation; made not a single explanation, nor correction of mistake or misunderstanding, but permitted them to proceed in their own way, and come to their own conclusion. He appeared to express no concern in the matter of their decision, but gave them an opportunity to act entirely free, thus giving the world a complete demonstration what the wickedness of humanity would do when left entirely to itself or free. What did it do? It cried, "Let him be crucified." When the Roman

judge had such scruples as to wash his hands before the court, as their custom was, and say "I have cleansed my hands of the blood of this innocent person," the rage of the Jews, their prejudice, and determination in the matter, were such, that they cried, "Let his blood be on us and our children." The Lord pity humanity when left to itself. How man should fear and dread the idea of the Lord leaving him to himself, to rush down to ruin! to condemn the innocent, and let the guilty go clear. The immaculate Savior is condemned to die, and the robber, Barrabas, is released.

What can not sin do? It can pervert civil courts—courts of justice—turn away their wise and good purpose, and make them a means to condemn the innocent and release the guilty. It can work into the highest courts, and secure the most cruel and wicked decisions, the most unjust and unreasonable. Sin can work its way up to the most august legislative bodies; gain the ascendancy over justice and equity; secure the enactment of the most unjust, partial, and cruel laws. It can control magistrates, executives, and prevent the enforcement of the purest and best laws ever enacted by man. It can push schemes of gain and oppression through the world. It can produce commotion, confusion, and strife, deluging the land in blood, filling it with widows and orphans, death and mourning! Still, men and women press it to their hearts!

Pilate went forth and said, "Behold, I bring him forth to you, that you may know that I find no fault in him." They deliberately placed a crown of thorns on his head, and robed him in purple; and as Jesus came forth, crowned with thorns, and robed in purple, Pilate exclaimed, "Behold the man!" *"Ecce Homo!"* When the chief priests and officers saw him, they cried out, "Crucify him, crucify him." Pilate said, "Take ye him, and crucify him, for I find no

fault in him." They responded, "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." These were religious men that thus persisted in the clamor to *crucify;* and not only religious men, but religious rulers and teachers. They were the men who were looked up to as examples in teaching and practice! The Lord pity the people, and have mercy on them when such men as these rule. Thick darkness was over their minds; their hearts were hardened; their minds were perverted; the way of righteousness they knew not. Little they knew of the wrath they were treasuring up against the day of wrath. Little did they know of the desolation that was hanging over their people, city, and temple. Little did they think that the God of Abraham would cast them off for their unbelief and hardness of heart. Yet these awful realities were before them.

They took him and led him away, "bearing his cross." Imagine that you see him, as he leaves the court, bearing his cross along the streets, crowned with thorns, and robed in purple, meekly and uncomplainingly. Rough and uncultivated men are thronging the way near by him, offering insult at every corner. Thousands of idle and thoughtless boys and girls throng the streets. Women are seen on the streets, sidewalks, in the doors and windows, uniting in the general popular current, clamoring, "Crucify him! crucify him!" A little to one side, are seen the priests, the rabbis, the doctors, lawyers, and scribes, in low tones, uttering words of wrath and bitterness. What a scene was this for men and angels to view! Is it not wonderful that the Lord did not smite the earth with a curse?

As the tradition goes, owing to his fasting, his wonderful agonies in the garden, and the suffering of his soul, in view of all the indignities he endured, his bodily strength gave way, and he sank beneath the weight of the cross

and they compelled one Simon, a Cyrenian, from the country, to bear his cross. The latter part of this is clearly stated, Luke xxiii: 26. They ascend the mount, and reach the appointed place. They extend his arms, and drive nails through his hands into the wood of the cross, lift it rudely from the ground, and plant it so that it will stand. There he hangs, on the rough iron spikes, through the thick part of his hands, all his muscles in a quiver, writhing in the most excruciating sufferings! The blood is seen tracing down over his temples as he hangs struggling for breath. Wicked, hard-hearted, and cruel men mock him. Even the thieves crucified, one on each side of him, revile him. One calls out, "If you are the Christ, come down from the cross." Three long hours he hung there, a spectacle to men and angels, in the midst of blasphemies, scoffs, and mockings! When the fever of death was on his lips, he called for a sip of water. What a small favor! only a sip of water, to cool the feverish, parched lips of the dying Savior! Did you ever, as you sat by the bed of the dying friend, hear the soft and gentle request for a sip of water? Do you remember with what inexpressible delight you gave the water? The dying Lord was not even afforded that relief! A man fastened a sponge on a reed, dipped it in vinegar, mingled with myrrh, and held it up to the lips of the suffering Redeemer. He turned away, refusing to drink it.

He suffers on a few minutes longer; and, looking back in the crowd, he saw a circle of women, a little more refined and elevated than the cruel masses. At all events, they had hearts that could be moved. They had common feelings of humanity. They, at least, to some extent, were sensible of his sufferings, and were weeping. Jesus lifted his eyes, and called out to them: "Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children." He saw not

only the present, but the future, both of these women and their children. He saw that awful calamity which hung over their nation, city, and temple, and had predicted their overthrow. The words he uttered were not merely for those women, but for the millions to come, showing that he fully comprehended all that was to come.

Again, he looked over the multitude, and saw the woman that gave him birth, the blessed Mary, the mother of Jesus. He called to her, "Woman, behold your Son!" What a scene was there for a mother to look on! Her Son, whom she had a thousand times, in his childhood, pressed to her heart, and whom she still loved as her Son, though he was her Lord and Redeemer, in the hands of most cruel and heartless enemies, hanging on an ignominious Roman cross; robed in purple and crowned with thorns, and his face all covered with blood, struggling for breath! Mothers, in the kingdom of Jesus, think of looking on your lonely son, in such sufferings and ignominy, in the midst of cruel enemies! Death is hard in its mildest form, but how hard and terrible in the midst of heartless and bitter enemies! Turning his eye to the beloved disciple, John, the apostle, he exclaims, "Son, behold your mother!" This appears to have been the only temporal arrangement he had to make. Every good man loves his mother. Jesus loved his mother, and made provision for her temporal wants when he was dying. He gave her the richest legacy he had, of an earthly nature, in giving John the beloved, one of the kindest and best of men, to be her son. He, at the same time, gave John a precious gift, in giving Mary, the mother of Jesus, to be his mother. John understood it, and took her to his own house, and cared for her till the day of her death. What an example this is to all men in reference to their mothers!

In the midst of all this, how does he act in reference to his enemies? Here is an example. Come, O you professed

followers of Jesus, and view this example, and then determine whether you know him, who was the chief among all the ten thousands, and altogether lovely. How did he feel toward his enemies and persecutors, in the midst of his most excruciating pains, being aggravated every moment by their perversity and malignity? Hear his words: "O, my Father, forgive them: they know not what they do." Blessed be his holy name! Well may we tremble when we come here, and hear this entreaty to his Father for them, and the extenuation offered, "they know not what they do." Do you say "It is not possible for *man* to be elevated to this degree?" It is possible, and was actually exemplified in the death of Stephen. When he was covered with bruises, was bleeding, and almost fainting in death, he cried, with a loud voice, "Lay not this sin to their charge." Well might such an one as he, in the last moments, say, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." This is truly rising above the world and above unaided human nature; by the grace of God, attaining to the divine nature; triumphing over the first Adam, by the power of the second, the Lord from heaven. While we were enemies, Christ died for the ungodly; and, while he was dying, he prayed for these enemies, "O, my Father, forgive them: they know not what they do!" In view of this, how can there be a human being that does not love Jesus? How can hardness of heart and impenitence turn away from this unbounded love?

Before he expires, he cries again: "Eli, Eli, lama sabach thani?" which, translated, is, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" In the midst of bitter and most unrelenting enemies, in his awful sufferings, he is left alone. No friend on earth attempts to comfort him. Not one even attempts to wipe the blood, mingled with the sweat of death, from his face! Not an angel comes near to offer the last

comfort! The Father's face is turned away! His enemies are left to themselves to show what they will do. They reach the climax of enormity, and show what the race would come to left in their hands.

They lift their eyes once more, and view him. He cries with a loud voice, breathes the last time, gives the last struggle; his head falls on his breast; he hangs in a quiver for a moment, and is gone. Jesus died! All stand in painful silence! There was a great earthquake! The rocks were rent! The vail in the temple is split in two from the top to the bottom. Darkness spreads down over the whole land from the sixth till the ninth hour. The centurion, witnessing all these things, exclaims, "Certainly, this man was the Son of God." His friends are disheartened. In disappointment and gloom, they turn away, saying, "We thought it was he who was to have redeemed Israel." They gave up all as lost, and turned away to their former avocations. The enemies were exultant and in triumph. All the powers of sin, darkness, and rebellion against God, of earth and hell, are in triumphant array. As they view it, they have ended his work and defeated his plan. He is cold and silent in death, and his body quietly lays in Joseph's new tomb. Little did they comprehend his plans. Little did they think of his founding a kingdom on his own death. They thought all was secure. All remained quiet till the dawn of the third day. The mighty question, involving the foundation of the kingdom, is in debate. Will he rise? His enemies on earth, and all those in the vast abyss of perdition, say no. Even his few and discouraged friends on earth are not expecting it. But all the principalities of the upper world, the mighty hierarchs about the throne, affirm he will rise. The time has come for the trial of the question—the final decision. An angel of God descends, and rolls away the stone from the entrance of the

tomb. The Roman soldiers, on guard, fall prostrate as dead men. The earth trembles! Jesus rose from the dead! The Lord is alive! A great number of the old saints, whose bodies rested in their graves about Jerusalem—as some have supposed about one hundred and forty-four thousand—rose, and were seen by many in the holy city after Jesus rose; as if the Lord intended giving a grander and fuller demonstration than his own resurrection, by itself, would have been of the resurrection from the dead. A resurrection for the human race is secured and now demonstrated.

This grand transaction settles the question. The Lord was condemned by men. They inflicted their penalty. He appealed the case to the high court of heaven—to God, the Judge of all. He reversed the decision, and removed the penalty, which was death, raising him from the dead. He was justified by the Spirit—declared innocent. After about forty days he ascended to heaven; was coronated, crowned Lord of all; received a name which is above every name—that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, both of things in heaven and things on earth. On the great Pentecost, the brightest day for this world the Lord ever made, the Holy Spirit descended, and made an open vindication before his persecutors, the Jews, out of every nation under heaven, declaring that God had raised him from the dead, and exalted him to his own right hand.

The patriarchal dispensation had been given, and lasted about twenty-five hundred years. The Mosaic dispensation, exclusively to the Jews, then followed, and extended over about fifteen hundred years more. During this period, the nations, apart from the seed of Abraham, were left to themselves, to work out the great problem touching what man can do, unaided by any system from God. In the end of the ages, God sent his only Son to make his last appeal, in the dispensation of mercy and grace, to the human race;

and, so to speak, the Gospel is the last effort of divine benevolence to reclaim and save fallen and sinful humanity. It comes, in its mighty truths and facts, surrounded by the most stupendous and grand displays of supernatural powers, signs, wonders, and mighty miracles, confirming its claims to divine authority, appealing to the human understanding. It thus appeals to the reason of man to convince him of its supreme authority. It points him to the inevitable ruin to which he is hastening, the eternal perdition before him, and the devouring flames that shall lash him forever if he obeys not the Gospel of the grace of God. But its last appeal is to the affections. It tells him that while he was yet in his sins, without God, and without hope in the world, God loved him—so loved him, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whoever believes on him might not perish, but have everlasting life—that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for the ungodly; and that he now is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance—that, in infinite kindness and compassion, the Lord stands all the day long stretching forth his hand to a gainsaying people, exclaiming, "What more could I have done that I have not done?"

He has made a full and perfect atonement for sin. In the end of the ages, he has made one sin-offering to purge us forever from our sins. He bore our sins in his own body on the tree. He suffered, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world. He now makes his last appeal to our affections. Can we not, and will we not love him, who first loved us? Shall any man be found so hardened and abandoned that he can not love him who withheld not his own Son, but gave him up freely for us all? Can any man, who has the heart of a man in him, look at this last appeal to the af-

fections of man as he hung, suspended between the heavens and the earth on that ignominious tree of the cross, crowned with thorns and robed in purple, till he breathed the last breath, gave the last struggle, and expired, and not love him? Can any human being, not perfectly callous and under the influence of total apathy—any one not wholly past feeling—view him, as the Roman spear pierces his side, and his warm heart's blood streams down like water on the ground, and not love him? How can any human being turn away from our Lord and refuse to love him?

This is God's last exhibition of mercy; the last offer of divine compassion. The man who closes his eyes to it, hardens his heart against it, and finally resists it; turns his back on it, spurns it, and dashes it from him, resists God's last and greatest exhibition of love, of kindness, and compassion, and is beyond the reach of redemption. The power of truth can not penetrate his heart. The power of reason can not move his understanding, and the most affectionate, merciful, and compassionate appeal can not move his heart. The resources of infinite mercy and grace have been expended and lost on him, and failed to reclaim him. Divine goodness can not impress his soul. Love can not move his heart. Tenderness and kindness are wasted on him. He is like a prodigal son, whose father has wasted a fortune on him; who despises his mother's tears and his father's prayers; turns away from all the love and affection of a kind father and mother; despises all their entreaties, and rushes on in his folly. His end is utter ruin. So the man who resists the truth of God, the grace, mercy, and compassion of his beneficent Creator and Benefactor, is an abandoned man. He has passed the rubicon. To him the door is closed. The voice of mercy is shut. No more appeals of love and compassion forever to his soul. He is becoming worse and worse, and is given over to work all

uncleanliness with greediness. He is left to continue his folly to his heart's content, and then lament it forever.

Soon the scene will be changed. His folly will all lay open before him, and he will see the utter ruin he has invoked on his own head. He will then exclaim, God loved me; Jesus died for me; the Gospel was preached to me; holy men exhorted me, prayed for me, and wept over me, and tried to induce me to turn to the Lord—tried to save me. They portrayed the sufferings of the Savior before me, and made their best appeals to me. The sick and the dying warned me, and plead with me, but I would not hear. The harvest is now past; the summer is now ended, and I am not saved. I am left to deplore my waywardness forever. The Lord has turned away his lovely face. The voice of mercy has ceased. The door of grace is closed. No more kind and compassionate invitations will be given. Adieu to all that is good, and pure, and holy forever. O man, whoever you are, standing aloof from God, turn, turn; why will you die? While it is an acceptable time, and a day of salvation, turn and live forever.

SERMON, No. XVII.

THEME.—THE CHURCH—ITS PURITY.

TEXT—"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal."—1 COR. xiii: 1.

THIS brief expression is selected from a lengthy letter of the apostle Paul to the Church in Corinth, because it contains a chief point in an important epistle, aimed to correct certain evils already existing among the Corinthians. No one can comprehend a lengthy letter like this from an isolated section, much less from a short text, like the one just read. To comprehend a letter like this it is necessary to take into view some of the manners and customs of the people in Corinth, but more especially the condition of the Church. To do this with any thing like clearness, the general scope of the letter must first be briefly sketched and considered. This is necessary on two accounts: 1. To get an understanding of the main scope of the letter. 2. To bring the Church in Corinth fully into view—evils and all—as it existed at the time when the letter was written.

The apostolic letters were all written to Christians; to those in Christ, to teach them how to live as such, serve God, and make their escape from a world of sin and wretchedness to the everlasting rest. No one need expect, then, sermons in these letters to the men of the world, leading

them to believe on the Savior of the world, repent, and turn to God. Those to whom these letters were written were all in Christ, in the one body, the heavenly family. They needed instructions as Christians, encouragements, admonitions, reproofs, exhortations; in one word, they needed the whole of what related to the continuance in the faith and practice of Christians. The apostle, under the miraculous influence of the Divine Spirit of all wisdom and revelation, continually exhibited the same affectionate care and solicitude for the congregations of the saints, as a parent for children, remembering them with tears in his prayers, night and day, when absent from them, and continually writing them letters, caring for them, comforting, and warning them.

In the first chapter of this letter, as now divided into chapters, and not as it was at first, the apostle introduces an evil existing among the disciples. Division was germinating in their midst; parties were forming factious heresies. These were arising, not from misunderstanding the Scriptures, nor from disagreement on the meaning of Scripture, nor yet from difference in regard to any fundamental principle in the new covenant, nor any important point of teaching, but from something far less than any of these—from preferences for their public men. This was their subject of difference, their bone of contention, their apple of discord. Some among them said they were of Paul, for Paul, or, in modern style, *Paulites*. Others were for Cephas, or Peter; they were *Cephasites*. Others were for Apollos, or they were *Apollosites*. At least, the apostle uses these names to bring out the principle involved among them, and expose the evil. It is, however, most likely that these were not really the names involved in the partyisms originating in their midst, but names of persons of much less importance; for he says, 1 Cor. iv: 6, "These things, brethren I have, in a figure, transferred to myself

and Apollos, for your sakes; that you might learn in us not to think of men above what is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another." He did not desire to mention the names of the men who were really involved, and who, most probably, had taken pleasure in having their names used by a party in the Church. Paul, Peter, and the eloquent Apollos, evidently stood higher in the affections of the brethren than the men really involved in the faction. Paul knew this, and wisely, as well as prudently, did not mention their names, but transferred the matter to himself and Apollos, showing that even their names might not be thus used as the head of and to designate a party, and certainly no other names. He puts the question to them: Who, then, is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom you believe? Does he regard it as "a wise providence of God" that they were preparing the way for division, and excuse it on the ground that it was not about any thing fundamental, but merely non-essentials? By no means. That only renders the matter the more inexcusable. Hear him: "And I, brethren, could not speak to you as to spiritual, but as to carnal, even as to babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat; for hitherto you were not able to bear it, neither yet now are you able. For you are yet carnal: for, whereas, there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are you not carnal, and walk as men? For while one says, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are you not carnal? Who, then, is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom you believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?" To take the vanity more fully out of these men who were desiring preferences, he says: "So, then, neither is he that plants any thing, neither he that waters, but God who gives the increase." See 1 Cor. iii: 1–7.

Touching their divisions, he puts the question to them

directly: "Is Christ divided?" Their dividing would indicate to the world that Christ was divided; but he knew that they would all be compelled to say the Lord is not divided, but one. This he follows up with the pointed question: "Was Paul crucified for you?" If you are to be called after men, they should have been crucified for you. Pressing the matter still more closely, he says: "Were you immersed into the name of Paul?" As if he had said, If you are to be Paulites, you should have been immersed into the name of Paul; but if you are Christians, or followers of Christ, then were you rightly immersed into the name of Christ. But he says, "I thank God that I immersed none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say I had *immersed into my own name.*" They, therefore, had not even the ground for saying they were of Paul, that he had immersed them, except a few of them. Now for his remedy. What is his remedy for this evil? He says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that you be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." See 1 Cor. i: 10.

In the fifth chapter, he calls their attention to a species of corruption, such, as he says, had not been named among the Gentiles. They had in their midst a low, degraded, and corrupt creature, in the form of a man, who had his father's wife. A more disgraceful specimen of humanity could not have been found. Yet they were puffed up instead of mourning that this degraded and disgraced man "might be taken away from among them." He proposes summary dealing with this flagrant and degraded transgressor. He commands them: "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when you are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one to

Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

There were those among the Corinthian disciples who went to law, brother with brother, before unbelievers. To this he alludes, 1 Cor. vi: 1–7. He says: "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do you not know that the saints shall judge the world? Know you not that we shall judge angels? how much more, things that pertain to this life?" He says: "I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?" He proceeds to charge them: "There is utterly a fault among you, because you go to law with one another;" and inquires of them, "Why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?" He proceeds further sharply to rebuke them: "Know you not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" What a warning this ought to be to all those groveling lovers of money or property, who will disgrace themselves and their brethren by going to law before unbelievers, in adjudicating pecuniary differences, rather than to refer it to their brethren!

Another disorder among them consisted in desecrating the worship, by substituting a pagan feast for the communion; and, instead of coming together on the first day of the week to break the loaf in commemoration of the Lord's death, they came together to participate in a bacchanalian feast. They did not even wait one for another, but rushed together in the utmost disorder, ate and drank to gluttony and drunkenness in the house of the Lord. To this you will find reference in the eleventh chapter. In speaking of the manner in which they came together, he says: "When you come together, therefore, in one place, it is not to eat the Lord's supper. For, in eating, every one takes before other

his own supper: and one is hungry and another is drunken What! have you not houses to eat and drink in? or despise you the Church of God, and shame them that have not?" What a standing warning this is to those who desecrate the worship of God, by feasts in the church, or any other means! He proceeds: "What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." He proceeds to lay before them what he had received of the Lord Jesus, and what he had delivered to them. Alluding to what he had delivered and commanded them to do, he adds: "For as often as you eat of this loaf, and drink of this cup, you do show the Lord's death till he comes." But he presently proceeds with that which is more solemn: "Whoever shall eat of this loaf, or drink of this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."

Many conscientious and well-meaning people have taken this passage wrong. They have, in many instances, so far mistaken the intention of this language as to refuse to do precisely what he commanded. They have supposed that eating and drinking unworthily was eating and drinking when they were oppressed in spirits or cast down, a little desponding, and when the pathway did not appear as bright as at other times. They then refused to partake, for fear of eating and drinking condemnation. But this is not what the apostle means. They who eat and drink to gluttony and drunkenness in the Lord's house, as the Corinthians did, *not discerning the Lord's body and blood*, eat and drink condemnation, and not the meek and humble, the cast down and timid, ever fearful of doing wrong. The vain and proud, the puffed up and conceited, who rushed together thoughtlessly, with light and frivolous hearts, ate and drank, laughed and talked, *not discerning the Lord's body and blood*, ate and drank condemnation. These the apostle rebukes "What!" says he, "have you not houses to eat and to drink

in? or despise you the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." On account of this desecration of the Lord's worship—this feasting, instead of partaking of the simple emblems of the Lord's body and blood, the loaf and cup—many among them were weak and sickly, and some had died. It was during miracles, and in the midst of their numerous gifts of prophecy, tongues, healing, etc., the Lord sent visible judgments on them as divine attestations of his disapprobation of their procedure. During this period there were two classes of miracles—one class evincing the Lord's approval of the right, and the other his disapproval of the wrong. The miraculous judgment sent on Ananias and his wife, as recorded Acts v: 1–10, was a visible divine demonstration of God's disapprobation of their conduct, in their lying pretense that they were giving the whole proceeds of the sale of the possession sold, when they were keeping back a part of it. This awful divine demonstration was given that it might be recorded and read by the children of God till the end of time, as a warning. No matter if we do live beyond the age of miracles, and no such judgment would fall on us now if we should do such a deed, still this would stand as a warning of God's disapproval and the eternal judgment he will finally pronounce. On the other hand, the miracle at the death of Stephen—of the heavens opening, and his seeing Jesus standing on the right hand of God—was a divine manifestation of God's approval of his good action, in preaching Jesus and withstanding the Jews. This, also, is now a matter of record, showing, to all who read the account, God's approval of that righteous man, and all like him, for standing for the Gospel of Christ till the end of time. So, also, the judgments sent on the Corinthians, on account of the desecration of the divinely appointed wor

ship, has been committed to the record, that it may be read by all the children of God till the end of time.

In the fifteenth chapter, the apostle refers to certain teachers, who probably had been proselyted from the sect of the Sadducees who denied the resurrection of the dead. These men were creating dissension and subverting the very foundation of the faith, as the apostle clearly shows. For if there is no resurrection, then Christ has not risen. If Christ has not risen, then the apostolic preaching is vain or useless, for it is all false; for they preached that Christ had risen and become the first fruits of them that slept. Then their faith was vain, for it was only the belief of a falsehood, and could not justify the sinner. In that case they were yet in their sins, and those who had fallen asleep in Christ had perished. The apostles, in that case, were of all men most miserable, for they had given up this world, and, without the resurrection of the dead, they were stripped of all hope in the world to come.

Now, the way is clear to take a look at the Church in Corinth, as it was at the time when this letter was written. Try and bring it before the mind as it was then, with schism at work in it, almost divided into three or four parts on account of their preferences and partialities for their preachers—some of them for Paul, some for Apollos, and some for Cephas, or Peter, a debased and corrupt creature in human form, who had his father's wife in it; brethren going to law with brethren before unbelievers; the communion turned into a pagan feast; members eating and drinking to gluttony and drunkenness in the Church of God; public teachers among them denying the resurrection of the dead. Besides these great evils, there were other irregularities of a very grievous and disorderly nature. Their prophets were in the habit of speaking two or three at a time, in as many different tongues, with a class of women, inquiring

into things that did not belong to them, or at least was not their place to inquire into in public worship.

Now, several things here are of great practical importance to us. In the first place, suppose you had come up just as Paul had completed this letter, and seen that he was writing all these things down in it, would you not have begged him to leave them out? Would you not have inquired, Brother Paul, where is this letter to be read, and by whom? He would have informed you, In all the world, by all Christians and civilized people till the end of time. Would you not have expostulated with him, by all means to leave some of those unpleasant and even disgraceful things out of his letter? Would you not have feared that it would be an injury to the Church and the cause to have this published thus among all people and in all time? Precisely the opposite would have been the result. The leaving of these things out would have shown an utter unfaithfulness on the part of the apostle, the disposition of a mere pretender and hypocrite, in passing over corruptions and keeping them from the world. The Lord makes faithful record, and there is but one way to keep bad things out of his record concerning us. That way is to keep these bad things out of our lives. The Lord, in the holy history, would not turn aside from faithful record to leave out the flaws in the life of Noah, the life of Abraham, or of David. Nor would he obscure from the view of the world the faults even of the apostles themselves. They are faithfully put down, not as any thing chargeable to the cause of righteousness, but chargeable to the weakness and imperfections of men—even the greatest and best of men.

But is it not an advantage to us that these things are in the record? Is it not of incalculable value that Paul has been thus faithful in reference to these evils? Surely it is. It is of importance, in several respects, to us now. We

should know fully the mind of the Lord in reference to all these evils, and how to deal with them. In addition to this, all men of extended experience in these matters have found the utter impossibility of attaining to any thing like absolute purity and perfection as churches; that when the best efforts are made by the best men to bring humanity up to the standard of absolute purity and perfection, they fall short; that all is not love, harmony, unity, and peace. There will still be evils found. When men have the experience to know this, and to become fully satisfied that, after the best efforts are made for humanity, it is found to be utterly unavoidable, they need another part of the programme to give them relief. If all these things had been left out of the apostolic letters, and no allusion had been made to any thing but absolute purity and perfection, love and harmony, peace and prosperity, they would have become discouraged, and concluded that they never could bring a church up to the example set us by the first churches. But now, sit down and read the letter under consideration; bring the Church in Corinth before you with as full a comprehension of all there was in it as possible, and inquire whether we have not succeeded in bringing many churches to a higher degree of perfection, a greater unity and harmony, more love and peace than existed in the Church in Corinth. You will find that, without any flattery, deception, or conceit, you can conscientiously say *we have*. There is not a doubt that we have many churches now much better in all that pertains to the kingdom of God and the name of Christ than the churches in the time of the apostles were.

How, then, did Paul address this church and look on it with all these evils in it? Did he denounce it, declare it no church, and turn his back on it? By no means, but addressed it affectionately as "the Church of God which is in Corinth, those sanctified in Christ Jesus, called saints."

Hear him again: "I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which was given to me in Christ Jesus." This shows that he recognized it as "the Church of God in Corinth," knowing all the evils in it. Nor is there any apology for sin in this, or any excuse for disorders or delinquencies; but there is in it an encouragement for good men who labor for purity, love, and harmony, but can not bring the Church up to the standard as fully as they desire. They can see that, under the very eyes of the apostles, and in spite of all their prayers and tears, their solemn solicitudes and anxieties, their holy teaching and exhortations, these wonderful evils and disorders existed. Then they need not be discouraged, despondent, or cast down if they encounter similar things in their own experience. In this there is no excuse for indifference, inefficiency, or carelessness in keeping the Church in order, purging out the old leaven or maintaining purity, but an encouragement to those who labor for the highest degree of purity and perfection but can not reach it.

In the same way, if there was a sharp difference between these two great and good men, Paul and Barnabas, so that they parted asunder, one going one way and the other another, or a difference between such men as Peter and Paul, while it is no excuse for good men to differ now or encouragement for them to do so, there is this encouragement in it—that nothing serious happened to the kingdom of God on account of it, an evidence that the common weaknesses of humanity existed in the best men in the world then the same as they do now. There is no need, therefore, of the childish alarm so frequently evinced among brethren when any dispute comes up among good men. These differences never sundered their fellowship or sent one man off with one faction and the other with another; but while one man went one way and the other went another, they both preached

the same Gospel, maintained and advocated the same cause, and remained in the same body. They did not rend the Church and scatter the disciples with their differences. So it is now. Differences come up between good men; they discuss them, and go on in the same body, preaching the same Gospel, and maintaining the same faith. They stand in the same fellowship—the same communion.

But now another practical point must be made. What would you do if you belonged to such a church as the one in Corinth? "I would call for a letter," says a man. "I would not remain in such a church." Why would you want a letter? "I would not fellowship such a church." What kind of a letter would you have the church give you? Would you have the church give you a letter commending their "dear brother, in good standing and full fellowship," while you are going away because *you can not fellowship* the church? No, sir; they can not, in good faith, give you a letter. If you can not, in good faith, recognize and fellowship the church, it certainly can not, in good faith, recognize you. "I would then leave without a letter." No, dear brother; that is neither manly nor Christian. When danger comes, the hour of trouble, every good member is needed. Every man that deserts his post then, and retires from the field, shows his want of integrity to the cause. The Lord's plan is to retain the good, the pure, and the holy, and put away the evil, the corrupt. This is one clear difference between the true Church and Antichrist: the true Church puts away the corrupt and vicious and retains the good.

The Romish Church, the apostate Church, or man of sin, cuts off the good and retains the corrupt within. Bishop Purcell admitted, in the discussion with Alexander Campbell, that he had no doubt that some of the wicked Popes were suffering the penal fires of hell at the time he spoke.

Still these corrupt men, whom even he would not defend, were not only retained in the Church, but at the head of the Church, while such men as Luther were cut off. The commandment of God is to "purge out the old leaven." "Put away the wicked person from among you."

"But I can live a Christian out of the Church." Are you sure of that? Why, then, did the Lord establish the Church? But suppose all the members would adopt your plan of living out of the Church; where would the Church be? It would destroy the Church from the face of the earth. Can a man live a Christian life and take such a course as would result in sweeping the Church from the face of the earth? Certainly not. Where would the ordinances be, then? Where would the preaching of the Gospel be? Where would the Bible itself be in that case? No; no one can live a Christian life out of the Church. Leave all the good out of the Church, and the Church is swept from the earth. The light from God is extinguished, and the world is left in ruins. The man who acts in such a way as would destroy the Church entirely from the earth if all should follow him, whether he intended it or not, is the enemy of the Church. But we need no such reasoning to show the importance of the Church. The Lord ordained it. That settles the question of its necessity. The man that proposes to live out of the Church, whether he means precisely that or not, substantially declares that he can do as well, and not follow the wisdom of God, as to follow it; that the Church which the Lord founded is an unimportant affair, and he can get along very well without it. This is utterly reckless. Suppose you could possibly live a Christian out of the Church. An old brick, lying in the street, is a brick as certainly as a brick in a good building; but what good is it doing, first knocked to this side, and then to that side of the street, liable to be run over by every old cart that comes along? It is doing about as

much good as the man is doing who claims to be a Christian but lives out of the Church.

But now, how did the Church in Corinth get into such a condition? This is a matter of importance, and demands attention. The Church was proud and boastful, with all the evils in it enumerated. Do you inquire how this could be? It occurred in this way: It abounded with supernatural gifts, having a great number of gifts of healing, tongues, interpretation of tongues, prophecy, etc. On account of these gifts, it was puffed up, boastful, and proud, when it had reason for mourning and grief. The argument, on the part of the Church, was brief. It amounted to this: We have more gifts of healing, prophecy, tongues, etc., than any other church, and are, therefore, better, enjoying the divine favor more largely. How humiliating to their pride it was to have the apostle say to them, in view of all their pride, boasting, and conceit, based on the abundance of their gifts, "Though I have the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." Some versions have the word "charity" here; but any person can see that the apostle does not mean charity, for he adds below, "though I give all my goods to feed the poor, and have not love, I am nothing." He could not bestow all his goods to feed the poor and not have charity. This would be the very embodiment of charity. But Paul's climax is, that though a man give all his goods to feed the poor, and even his body to be burned, and have not *love*, he is nothing. He still strikes a more fatal blow: "Though I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, and have not *love*, I am nothing." This is the best definition of a *faith alone* man found in any book. A man may not only have faith, but *all faith*, so as to remove mountains, and because he has not love with it, *he is nothing*. As if the apostle had said: You have boasted of your supernatural gifts; your proph-

ecies, tongues, knowledge, etc., and been puffed up; but you may have all these gifts, you may have the tongues of men and of angels, the gift of prophecy, all knowledge, you may have faith so that you can remove mountains, give all your goods to feed the poor and your bodies to be consumed, as martyrs in the flames, but if you have not *love*, you are nothing.

Why does he thus speak? Because, at the very time when these miraculous gifts abounded in their midst, and they were boasting of them and glorying in them, they had not love enough to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; to restrain them from shouting for their favorite man, "I am for Paul, I for Apollos, and I for Cephas;" not love to God and the cause enough to put away a corrupt man from their midst; to restrain them from going to law, brother with brother, before infidels; nor to induce them to maintain, in its purity, the communion of the blood and body of the Lord; nor to maintain the confidence that God will raise the dead; and, with all your miraculous gifts, and without this love, you are an empty sound. Truly was this withering on those proud and boastful men.

The apostle then determines to make them appreciate the importance of love, and proceeds to personify it, and speak of it as if it were a member of the Church. In doing so, he tells what love will do and what it will not do. He specifies seven things that love will do, as follows: 1. "Suffers long." 2. "Is kind." 3. "Rejoices in the truth." 4. "Bears all things." 5. "Believes all things." 6. "Hopes all things." 7. "Endures all things." He also specifies nine things that love will not do, as follows: 1. "Envies not." 2. "Vaunts not itself." 3. "Is not puffed up." 4. "Does not behave itself unseemly." 5. "Seeks not its own." 6. "Is not easily provoked." 7. "Imputes no evil." 8. "Rejoices not in unrighteousness." 9. "Never fails." If you fear that you have not this love, look over this list, and if you can

say, honestly, *I will do* each of the seven things which the apostle says love will do, and *will not do* each of the nine things he says love will not do, you have the love of which he speaks. Here is a beautiful chance for self-examination. All pious persons exercise much self-examination. In this they can use great freedom. They can enter into the very motives, the very thoughts and intents of the heart; make the examination most rigorous and scrutinizing. What a beautiful exercise it would be for a disciple of the Lord to retire to some quiet seclusion, with the New Testament open at this passage, and, after a fervent prayer for the Lord's help in obtaining a clear understanding of the whole matter and practical application, commence and go over, item by item, the seven things which love will do, and the nine which it will not do! This would be communing with and learning of God. This is piety.

A careful comment on each one of these items is not to be expected here; but since so much is said about what is needful in keeping churches in order and making them successful, etc., a few words in a general way will not come amiss here. Some think we need some special kind of a preacher in order to success. Others think we need better qualified overseers, and others are proposing some improvement in deacons. Some are for more rigorous discipline. No doubt there may be improvement in all these departments. In many instances the main improvement is needed on the part of the members. In some instances, they turn off a preacher and get a new one with profit. Still, there are some other instances in which they need about as much to *turn off the church and get a new one.* In deliberative bodies they sometimes form themselves into a committee of the whole, in the consideration of an important matter. If any one would see how easily a church ought to be managed, suppose the church would appoint each member a committee

of one to oversee, look after, and take care of one member; this would reach and provide for all the members. Then, many talented and influential members would think this too little; that their talents and influence would not find scope in such a narrow circle. But, then, the proposition is to have the work done *well*. In order to do this you only need oversee one, if all the members do their part of the work, to oversee the whole church. Do you say that you desire the one you are appointed to look after and oversee shall be near by, so that you can attend to the work faithfully without unnecessary loss of time or labor? That is well thought of, and should, by all means, be taken into the account in appointing. It would be a matter of great convenience to have it arranged so that you could be present in the business department at every meal you eat, in the domestic circle, and, indeed, all the time, that you may exercise the most careful oversight. It should be some one whom you love dearly, and for whose salvation you have a deep interest. To accommodate you in all these respects, the church should appoint you to oversee and look after *yourself*. You can then always be present to witness every impropriety, idle word, and foolish thought; offer rebukes, interpose restraints, administer corrections, etc. You can then always administer reproofs in kindness, love, and affection, so that they may give no offense, but bring forth the fruits of righteousness. This is not intended to set aside all necessity for preachers, overseers, and deacons, but to assist them and render their work much more light and less difficult than it would otherwise be.

Love is the all-prevailing element for maintaining order peace, and harmony in the Church. Where it does not abound, all is dull, formal, and lifeless. There may be a mechanical management according to rule—a kind of conformity without it, but the enjoyment is not there without it.

"It is the golden chain that binds
The happy souls above;
And he's an heir of heaven that finds
His bosom glow with love."

One of its chief glories is, that "it never fails." "Whether there be prophecies, they shall cease; whether there be tongues, they shall fail; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." But *love never fails.* As if the apostle had said: You Corinthians are boastful, conceited, and puffed up on account of your abundance of spiritual gifts, but all this belongs to the infancy of Christianity, the creative and formative period; but when the stature of manhood shall come; when this creative and formative period shall cease; when the revelation shall be complete, and a state of maturity shall be reached, these gifts, employed in the incipiency of things, shall all pass away. Then I will show you a more excellent way.

Every thing in this universe had its beginning in miracle. The first human pair were brought into existence by a miracle. The human race begun by direct supernatural power, but has been perpetuated by the natural; began by direct extraordinary power, but has been perpetuated by the indirect and ordinary power. It required a miracle to bring the first man and woman into existence, but no miracle for all other men and women to descend from these. It required a direct exertion of supernatural power to bring into existence the first oak-tree, but it is only the operation of natural power for an oak-tree to produce an acorn, and for another oak-tree to spring from that acorn, and so on down through all the generations of oak-trees to the last one that shall ever grow. God created man, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. This was a miracle. From the flesh and bone of this man the Lord formed the first woman. This was a miracle also But he never brought into exist-

ence another human pair by a miracle. The race have all descended from this first pair without a miracle. They originated in supernatural power, but have been perpetuated by natural power. They came into existence by extraordinary means, but the race has been perpetuated from them down by ordinary means. Every species of the creation of God had its origin in extraordinary power or means, but has been perpetuated by ordinary means. In the same way the Church of the living God was a new creation. It was brought into existence by a miracle, but has been perpetuated without miracle. It was created, and the breath of life breathed into it by miracle, but no church is now created and life breathed into it in the same way, but the Church has been perpetuated from the original Church. It originated in extraordinary power, but has been perpetuated by ordinary power. Miracles were, therefore, necessary in bringing the Church into existence, establishing and confirming it, but not necessary in perpetuating it. The bringing it into existence, establishing and confirming it among men, required extraordinary means, but not required in perpetuating it.

The supernatural gifts were, therefore, demanded in the creative period, but belonged to the infancy of the Church; hence the apostle, in allusion to this, says: "When I was a child I spoke as a child, I thought as a child, I had the understanding of a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things." These gifts pertained to the infancy of the Church; but when the Church and revelation came to maturity, those things that pertained to the incipient state were taken away. The more excellent way was introduced, and prophecies failed, tongues ceased, and the supernatural gift of knowledge was done away. Now faith, hope, and love remain; but the greatest of these is love. How weak and foolish it was, then, for the disciples in Corinth to be

carried away by their abundance of spiritual gifts; to become proud and boastful on account of these gifts, while they had not the love to maintain the purity of the Church. In the same way, how vain and foolish it is for any church to be puffed up by fine gifts of an ordinary character, now that the extraordinary is done away, and not be under the influence of the love of Christ! Some have vainly imagined that these gifts ceased through unbelief; but that can not be so, for in the same connection, where he says these miraculous gifts shall cease, he says: "Now abide faith, hope, love; but the greatest of these is love." This *way* when these gifts shall cease, and faith, hope, and love abide, he calls "a more excellent way," in the close of the chapter preceding this.

The first public instructors in the Church were made such, or qualified for their work, in an extraordinary manner, but since these gifts ceased, men are qualified for the same work in an ordinary manner. The Lord said, in the great intercessory prayer, John xvii: 8, "The words which thou gavest me I have given them;" that is, the apostles. They were qualified for making a revelation by miracle. The Lord gave them the word which the Father gave him. This same word they gave to others. Hence, Paul says to Timothy, "The things which you have heard of me, in the presence of many witnesses, the same do you commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." The Lord, by inspiration, or by extraordinary means, made the revelation to the apostles; but without any miracle, in the ordinary way of teaching, the same things were communicated to Timothy and others like him. Timothy and other evangelists were qualified in the ordinary way, by hearing and receiving the things the apostles taught; and, in the same manner, qualified others. Hence, the command of the apostle to Timothy, to give himself to reading, to meditation, etc., and

not to look for immediate revelation. Such men as Timothy, reared up under the apostles, and qualified by ordinary instruction, were required to devote themselves to study, reading, and meditation, to prepare them for their great work. But the Lord expressly commanded the apostles not to meditate beforehand what they should say, and required them to depend wholly on supernatural aid, or inspiration, for what they were to utter; and that, too, in the most perilous and critical trials through which they should be called to pass, especially when they should be called to stand before kings and governors on trial for preaching Jesus. They depended, not on the amount they knew, any human talent, learning, or ability, in making their defense, or in opening up the will of God to man, but on the supernatural power that was in them, the miraculous inspiration of the Spirit of God. What they uttered was revelation from God. They did not prove their teaching by argument or Scripture, as a general rule, but proved by divine and indisputable demonstrations of supernatural power that they were divinely called and sent—that the words spoken by them were not *their* words, but the words of the Spirit of God; not the words spoken by man's wisdom, but the words spoken by the wisdom of the Spirit of God. When such men as Timothy, Titus, Barnabas, Apollos, Mark, Luke, etc., spoke, they uttered the things which they had heard and learned of the apostles. It was, therefore necessary that they should have given themselves to reading, meditation, study, that they might show themselves approved of God, workmen who need not be ashamed, rightly setting forth the word of truth. But the proof they gave that what they uttered was from God, was that they had obtained it from the apostles, and not that they were inspired men, as the apostles were, and spoke by authority, as the apostles did. No man in our time can reach a higher po-

sition than this. We have no embassadors of Christ now, no apostles of Christ, no inspired men. None now are miraculously called and sent. There are no proofs to show that what we preach is from God, if they are not the things taught by the apostles. We prove nothing now by claiming to be specially called and sent, as the apostles were, that we speak by inspiration, as they did, except that we are impostors. We receive all the apostles taught implicitly, being assured that they were under the influence of the infallible inspiration of God, their divine claims being continually confirmed by the most grand, imposing, and stupendous displays of miraculous power. The promise of Jesus, "Lo, I am with you always," was verified to them in the continual performance of miracles.

But if it was weak and childish for the Corinthian disciples to be proud of those sublime spiritual gifts, such as prophecies, tongues, wisdom, etc., of a miraculous character, what shall be said of the man now, or the church, proud of ordinary gifts, as learning, talent, influence, etc., and puffed up, conceited, and inflated? These ordinary gifts are from God. What has any man that he did not receive? Yet there are men and churches proud, puffed up, and conceited on account of these ordinary gifts, and not possessing love enough for Christ, the children of God, and the cause, to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; not love enough to stand for purity, the harmony, and the advancement of the cause; not love enough for Christ to put away corrupt persons from their midst; to prevent them from litigations before the civil courts—having pagan feasts in the church, or the denial of the resurrection of the dead. What an abandonment of all that is pure and lovely—of all that is holy, just, and good!

The supernatural gifts of the original Church have long since all passed away. They served the purpose for which

they were intended, and, according to the will of God, ceased. So, also, shall the finest ordinary gifts possessed by man all cease. They shall all fail. In the same way, all that we possess shall fail. Houses, lands, moneys, goods, and chattels of every sort, shall all be nothing to us in a short time. All earthly friends must also fail us. Even faith itself shall culminate in actual knowledge. The things that we now enjoy by *faith* we shall then enjoy by *sight*. Hope shall also be swallowed up in real possession. That which we now hope for we shall then actually possess. What, then, have we now that we shall carry with us? We have that wonderful *love* of which the apostle speaks, and shall have it forever. It is stronger than death. It first moved our hearts to turn to God. We love God because he first loved us. The same love that first moved us to turn to the Lord, has moved us in every righteous effort, every holy impulse, every prayer, every song, every time we have gone to the house of God, from the day we confessed the Savior till now; and shall move our hearts in all that is holy, just, and good till we die. In the hour of death it shall dwell in us richly, in joy and peace inexpressible. It shall dwell in us forever and ever. It binds in holy union and oneness all the heavenly hosts. Its years are the years of God. It shall last co-existent with the Infinite One himself. Let it, then, rule in our hearts, reign over us, and abide forever and ever.

Love is the golden link connecting the good on earth with the heavenly hosts, binding the whole family, in heaven and on earth, in one pure and holy union, communion, and fellowship—in the same spirit, the same mind, and the same judgment. It shall never fail. When health fails, when earthly friends fail, when property fails, when life fails, when we shall cross the cold and chilly river of death, and sink into the grave, love shall not fail. Beyond the rolling river

it shall live and abound forever and ever. Happy are the saints under its hallowed influence. Happy are all the heavenly hosts, animated and bound together by it. Happy shall be all the pure in heart forever and ever, for it shall never fail them.

But what is the prospect of the human being not under the influence of this love? Truly, it is gloomy for such. They are without the greatest comfort now in existence for man; in a cold and cheerless world, with death before them, the judgment and eternity—not a ray of light nor a gleam of day. No heart animated by love! No hope, and without God in the world! Eternal night lies away in the wonderful future! Can any intelligent man or woman live in such a state of gloom—not a promise, not a hope—all dark and threatening? Come, be entreated by all that is kind and lovely, to turn away from the vanities and follies of a world of sin, and give yourselves to him who is the way, the truth, and the life, and be happy forever. "He is the chief among all the ten thousands, and altogether lovely."

SERMON, No. XVIII.

THEME.—THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WORLD.

TEXT—"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief, in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth, and the works that are in it, shall be burned up."—2 PET. iii: 10.

THE first thing to which the attention of the hearer is invited, is the description given by the apostle of the men who should come in the last days—false teachers. He says, "There will come in the last days scoffers." "The last days," here, can not be the last days of the Jewish dispensation, for these had passed away some thirty or thirty-five years before the apostle wrote. They are evidently the "last days" of the Christian dispensation. But what kind of a description does he give of these men? He deliberately writes them down as "scoffers," and gives us a specimen of their logic. They shall insincerely, scoffingly, and in derision say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" They will argue that there can be no promise of his coming, "for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." These men walk after their own lusts or their own desires. They receive nothing, because the Lord has said it, but are led by their own carnal desires, believing simply what they desire to believe. But the apostle says "They are willingly ignorant of this,

that by the word of God the heavens of old had their being, as also the earth, consisting of water and subsisting by water: by which things the world that then was, having been overflowed with water, perished." These grand events in the world's history willfully escape their attention, and they stupidly and blindly assert that "all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." This is not only blindness, but *willful* blindness. They have lost sight of the overthrow of the monarch of Egypt, the "vessel of wrath," raised up that God's power might be known in all the earth; the destruction of the antediluvian world, of Sodom, Tyre, and Sidon, and the overthrow of the Jews, and their dispersion among all nations, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. All these wonderful events have escaped their attention, and they are the blind and willing slaves of passion and bigotry. They can see no promise of his coming. True, the threatenings of God had been fulfilled to the letter; his divine judgments executed, with the most stupendous displays of his wrath and vengeance on the nations and peoples who despised his authority; but the coming of the Lord, to raise the dead and judge the world; "to take vengeance on them who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;" to "punish them with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," they maintain can never occur.

With the scoffers of the last days it avails nothing if the angels did say, "This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, shall come in the same manner in which you saw him go into heaven." See Acts i: 11. Nor does it amount to any thing with them that Paul speaks of "the revelation of our Lord Jesus from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, to take vengeance on them who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," as we read, 2 Thess. i: 7; nor yet does it avail any thing

with them that the Lord himself has said, as we read, Matt. xxv: 31, that "the Son of Man shall come in his own glory, and all the holy angels with him," and that "he will sit on the throne of his own glory, and all nations shall be gathered before him; and he shall separate them, one from another, as a shepherd separates his sheep from the goats." All these scriptures, and numerous others, go for nothing with the hardened scoffer. How different the spirit of the holy John, when he penned the last words of the New Testament, "Come, Lord Jesus!"

But there is another class of scoffers that this discourse has to do with. They say the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ has long since occurred—that he came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem; that he there judged the world; separated the righteous from the wicked, and, consequently, argue that the coming of Christ, the judgment, and punishment of the wicked are all long since gone by. This fallacy must now be refuted. It must be shown that the coming of the Lord is yet future.

1. The first scripture to which reference is made for this purpose is found Acts iii: 19: "Repent, therefore, and turn, in order that your sins may be blotted out, so that season of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send Jesus Christ, who was destined for you: whom heaven must retain till the times of restitution of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the beginning of time."

Those who say the coming of Christ is passed, say that "restitution" in this passage means *salvation*, and that "restitution of all things" is salvation of all men, for, they say, "all things" certainly includes *all men*. Take them first on their own ground, that "restitution of all things" means salvation of all men, or that it at least includes the salvation of all. How long, then, is the heaven to retain Jesus

Christ? "Till the restitution of all things," or the salvation of all men? Is their salvation of all men past or future? Did their salvation of all men occur before the destruction of Jerusalem? Peter said, some forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, of Christ: "Whom the heaven must retain till the times of restitution of all things." If, then, the "restitution of all things" means or includes the salvation of all men, and if the heaven must retain Jesus Christ till the restitution of all things, Jesus Christ did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at any other time between then and now, for it is incontrovertibly certain that the salvation of all men has not come. But the Universalist says that no man shall stand on his own ground and argue. Then look at the case from the true ground. What, then, is the meaning of "restitution of all things?" It is evident that "restitution" does not mean *salvation* by the following part of the connection. You readily inquire, "Restitution of what?" The Universalist replies, "Restitution of all things." All what things? Does the apostle mean absolutely *all things*, or "all things" of a certain class which he describes? "All things" of a described class. You must not quote the passage in the popular style, as follows: "All things," etc., but you must follow up, with inquiry, All what things? The apostle answers: "All things *which God has spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets since the beginning of time.*" This shows that restitution does not mean *salvation.* It makes no sense to talk of the *salvation* of all things which God has spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets, for the "things which God has spoken" have never been *lost,* and there is no sense in speaking of the salvation of that which was never lost. There are but two ways in which the language can be taken with intelligence: 1. "Whom the heaven must retain till the times of *accomplishment* or *fulfillment* of all things which God has spoken by the mouth of all

his holy prophets." 2. "Whom the heaven must receive till the times of restoration of all things which God has *promised* by the mouth of all his holy prophets since time began." This latter is most probably the true meaning. The apostle then says of Jesus Christ, "Whom the heaven must receive till the times of restoration of all things promised by all the holy prophets." This proves, beyond doubt, that he did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that he has not come at any time between that time and the present; for the heaven must retain him till the restoration of all things promised by all his holy prophets, and certainly the restoration of all things promised by all his holy prophets has never yet come.

2. Please hear the great apostle to the Gentiles: "But we beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our coming together to him, that you be not hastily shaken from the persuasion of your mind, nor be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by report, nor by letter as written by us, as though the day of the Lord is at hand." 2 Thess. ii: 1, 2. Now, at what period did the apostle stand when he wrote this? Certainly not more than sixteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem. If, then, the destruction of Jerusalem was only sixteen years off, and the coming of the Lord was to be at the same time, was it not proper to say "The day of the Lord is at hand?" Certainly when an event of that kind is within sixteen years of us, it is *at hand*. But it was false then to say "the day of the Lord is at hand;" and in view of some saying this, Paul said: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day *shall not come, unless the apostasy come first*, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposes and exalts himself above every one that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he sits as God in the temple of God, openly showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. ii: 3, 4. This

puts an end to all idea of the Lord coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, for the apostle asserts roundly that "that day shall not come unless the apostasy comes first." The apostasy, or "mystery of iniquity," was only beginning to work when Paul wrote this letter. This "apostasy," described in the same connection as the "man of sin," the "son of perdition," was to be fully revealed before the coming of the Lord, but the proper time for his full development had not come when Paul wrote. The restraining power was in the way, and would continue to restrain till he would be taken out of the way. This "man of sin," "son of perdition," "lawless one," is unquestionably the great Romish apostasy, "whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the spirit of his mouth, and will utterly overthrow by the brightness of his coming." See 2 Thess. ii: 8. This shows that the Lord has not yet come, for he "will destroy by the spirit of his mouth, and utterly overthrow by the brightness of his coming" this great "apostasy," or "man of sin." So long, then, as Popery is not utterly overthrown, destroyed, the Lord has not come.

3. In Luke xxi: 24 is found one of the most remarkable predictions in the whole Bible. It reads as follows: "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away captives among all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Who were to fall by the edge of the sword? The Jews. This is the destruction of Jerusalem. "They, the Jews, shall be led away captive among all nations." This captivity of the Jews, beyond all doubt, extends till the present time. "And Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." This unquestionably extends down to the present time. Jerusalem is still trodden down by the Gentiles, and the times of the Gentiles are not yet fulfilled. What, then,

shall occur after this captivity of the Jews, this treading down of Jerusalem and the fulfillment of the times of the Gentiles." After all this, the Lord says, "And then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory." This puts the coming of Christ after the captivity of the Jewish nation among all nations, after the treading of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, and after the fulfillment of the times of the Gentiles, and puts it in the future to us, beyond all doubt.

§ 1 Cor. xv. 22. Paul says: "As by Adam all die, so also by Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward those who are Christ's at his coming." This "making alive" will be in the resurrection from the dead. The language is very elliptical. Filling the ellipses, it will read as follows: "As by Adam all die, so also by Christ shall all be made alive. But each shall be made alive in his own order: Christ the first-fruits shall be made alive; afterward those who are Christ's shall be made alive at his coming." When are those who are Christ's to be made alive? In the resurrection from the dead, at his coming. This settles the question of his coming, showing that it is yet future, and will be at the resurrection of the dead.

In eighteen hundred and forty-three, many had set the time for the coming of Christ to the very day, if not the very hour. On the set day they were sitting about, gazing up into heaven. Some poor deluded creatures had prepared themselves ascension robes—white robes, in which to ascend and meet the Lord in the air, so carnal and materialistic were their views. Many good and true men, however, maintained that the time could be determined when the Lord would come, and were so confident about it that they used to say, "If the Bible is true the Lord will come" on the set day. Some went so far, that they declared that they

would not believe the Bible if the Lord did not come at the set time. Others, with much pertinancy, would reply: "If the Lord does not come on your set day, I shall not conclude that the Bible is not true, but that your interpretation of the Bible is not true." While there was no doubt about the Bible being true, there was much doubt about their understanding the Bible. Men of intelligence had so much confidence in the truth of the Bible, and so little confidence in their interpretation of it concerning *the time* of the coming of the Lord, that their failure by no means shook their faith. It was nothing but a mistake *in men*, a failure *in understanding* the Bible, and no failure *in the Bible itself.*

One grand plea, made by the Adventists then, and also made by the much less conscientious Adventists now, for determining the precise time of the coming of the Lord, was, and now is, that men will repent if convinced that the Lord will come at a certain set time. But there are several things to be considered about this matter:

1. If you prove to be mistaken about the time, and the Lord should not come at your appointed time after you have declared so confidently that he will come at that time, *if the Bible is true*, who will then be led to repentance by your plea? Will you not rather lead men to disbelieve the Bible? The process of reasoning will then be short and easy. The preacher said, "If the Bible is true, the Lord will come at the set time." The Lord did not come at the set time, therefore the Bible is not true. If you fail, so far as the people had confidence in you their faith will be shaken.

2. But you miss the Lord's argument. His argument is that we must be *always ready*, because we *know not the time* when the Lord will come. Your argument is, that we should know the time, and make known the time, that we and the people may repent and prepare for his coming, be-

cause we and they *know the time.* You remind one of children, who want to know the precise time when their parents will return home, that they may straighten up and set themselves in order against the time when the parents will get home. It is evident that the children would conduct themselves better if they knew that the parents would return, but knew *not when.* In that case they must be ready all the time, because they know not when their parents will return. So the Lord intends us to be always ready, because we *know not* the time.

3. It was certainly no part of the Lord's teaching, nor that of his apostles, to set the time, or show the time the Lord had set, and it is equally certain that the Lord declared that no man knows the time. The man of faith believes him who has assured us that no man knows the time, and not those who claim to know the time. The true exhortation of the Lord is, to be *always ready, because you know not when your Lord shall appear.*

4. It has been right to look for the coming of the Lord, and stand in readiness for it, from the apostolic day to the present time, because the time is not revealed—no man knows when he will appear. It would not have been right to have looked for the coming of the Lord in the apostles' day, if they had known that he would not come till some time now future. It is unequivocally certain that they looked for the coming of the Lord, not because *they knew* when he would come, but because they did *not know* when he would come.

It is right to look for the coming of the Lord now, as it has been right all the time since he ascended to heaven, simply because he has not revealed the time, but exhorted us to be always ready. It was right to look for and hasten to the coming of the day of the Lord in the time of the apostles; but it was not right then, and is not right now, to say

"the Lord delays his coming," and makes the delay an excuse to do evil. The Lord will certainly come, and will not disappoint his true followers, not because they know when he will come, but *because they are always ready and looking for him.* If he should come immediately, they will not be disappointed, for they are always looking for him; if he should not come immediately, they will not be disappointed, for they know not when he will appear. They are prepared for his coming, or not coming, at any time. If he should defer his coming till the fortunes of the future of the Church would be vastly greater than all the fortunes of the past of the Church; or if he should defer his coming till the number of all who have been redeemed by his blood, in the whole history of the past, would not be as a drop to the bucket compared with the innumerable company which shall yet be redeemed and brought to God through our Lord Jesus Christ, they will not be disappointed. They will still look for him, and continue to look for him till he comes. Their faith and hope are not in the certain knowledge they have of the *precise time* when he will come, but the certainty that *he will* come and take his ransomed people home. This faith is in the *certainty that he will come,* and not *in their certain knowledge when he will come.* Their hope is in the full assurance that he will come, and the grand events that shall occur at his coming, and not in any certain knowledge about the precise time when he will come. Let his saints constantly live in the blessed hope that he will come; that they shall see him, and be like him, for they shall see him as he is, and live in the Spirit that John was in when he wrote the words "Come, Lord Jesus."

But more special attention must now be given to the destiny of this world. It has undergone innumerable changes during the six thousand years since the Mosaic creation. Among these changes there is the one grand change

produced by the flood, the most wonderful connected with the entire history of the human race. Concerning this event, blind unbelief has blundered and stumbled. Some of the things that infidels have said about the flood would be as miraculous as the Mosaic account of the flood. A few infidel speculations must receive a brief notice here.

1. One infidel theory, advocated about one hundred years ago, was to the effect that, by accurate scientific experiment, it had been determined how much water was in the air, the earth, lakes, seas, and oceans, and that there was not enough belonging to the globe, all combined, to make such a flood as that of which Moses gives us an account. Hence the account given by Moses must be discarded. Many infidels laughed over this, and maintained that the light of science would soon sweep away the traditions and superstitions of the Bible. To this, however, reply was made by men of science, sweeping away the infidel theory by the developments of true science. But that you may see how much confidence may be reposed in the infidel theories arrayed against the Bible, turn to a modern theory, advocated and received by infidels of the present time. They, as geologists and philosophers, undertake to solve the following difficulty: In Western Pennsylvania, across Central Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Southern Missouri, and, perhaps, as far west as Kansas, round, hard, flinty rocks are found, varying in size from a pebble to many tons' weight. They commence theorizing about these rocks. As geologists and philosophers, it would not do to admit that they do not know all about them. They, therefore, decide, in the first place, that these rocks are not natives of the countries referred to where they are found. The next thing is to determine where they are from. They decide that they are natives of the Arctic region. Then the tough question comes up, how they were transferred to this country. Rec-

ollect, these are men who have no credulity; who can not believe the Mosaic account of a flood, nor the Bible in general! They tell us that in the Arctic regions there are immense ranges of mountains, extending many thousands of miles east and west, of enormous height, almost perpendicular on the side facing the south; that during their six months' night the freezing is immense on these mountain sides, and during their six months' day it thaws, and thus, thawing and freezing for ages, these rocks are thrown out and roll down the mountain sides and into the immense ocean of ice below. Thus, they argue, they had been loading into this ocean of ice for ages, and that there was then a vast inundation of water that hove up this vast ocean of ice, with all those rocks on it, and that the shape of the globe is such that it floated across this valley, and, as the ice melted away, deposited these rocks where they are found in this great valley.

Thus it is seen that the infidels, one hundred years ago, determined that there was not water enough belonging to the globe to make a flood. Now they find water enough to float an ocean of ice across a continent, freighted with rocks, depositing them over an expanse of country extending a thousand miles in length! Which infidel Bible shall we believe—the one a hundred years ago, that found no water sufficient for a flood, or the one now finding water enough to float an ocean of ice across a continent, freighted with rock?

Some one is ready to say that the land has been raised in the country where these rocks are deposited, and that it did not take the same amount of water before it was raised to float an ocean of ice over it that it would now since it has been raised. Then may it not be that other parts of the earth have also been raised since the flood, and that it did not require the same amount of water to extend over

the earth before it was raised than it would now? One thing is certain, and that is, that whether the greatest elevations of the earth have been raised or not, the waters of the ocean have, at some period, been over them. As Hugh Miller would say, "The testimony is *in the rocks.*" The inhabitants of the ocean are found petrified in the rocks, bearing testimony, to be read and known of all men, corroborating the Mosaic history of the flood.

The same men who could not believe the history of the flood one hundred years ago, maintained, also, that the prophetic Scriptures, that speak of the world being destroyed by fire, could not be fulfilled. They argued that the world could not be "burned up," as Peter says, for three-fourths of its surface are covered with water, and the earth itself is not inflammable or combustible matter, and could not burn—that such a thing is impossible. This is the way their Bible—the book of nature—read *to them* a hundred years ago. How does it read *to them* now? They are now telling us that, after passing a comparatively thin crust over the surface of the earth, of some sixty miles in thickness, there is nothing but one vast lake of fire in the interior of the earth, equal, in the intensity of its heat, to the hottest metal that ever flowed from a smelter's furnace! The testimony they give of this is chiefly in the fearful material that issues from volcanoes, the earthquakes, and the diameter of the earth being greater at the equator than at the poles, which they suppose to be occasioned by its centrifugal force. It is not necessary now to stop to inquire whether this is all so. It is enough to know that this is the way they are now reading the book of nature, or, at least, a large class of the men who say they can not believe the Bible. Taking it, then, that they are correct, what shall be said of their brethren who lived one hundred years ago? With their view of it, the wonder was how the world could be

burned up; but, with the view of the modern men to whom reference has been here made, the wonder is how it is preserved and kept from burning up! If the entire mass of the globe, saving what geologists call "the crust," is nothing but a vast ocean of melted lava—a "lake of fire"—whirling over once in twenty-four hours, or carrying us one thousand miles an hour on its surface as it revolves on its axis, traveling at the same time with inconceivable velocity as it courses its vast circuit of near six hundred millions of miles in its annual journey around the sun, is not the wonder how the Almighty can preserve it and keep it from destruction? The wonder with men of intelligence is, how it has been preserved, in its mighty movements among the innumerable bodies, in vast, incomprehensible, and illimitable space, for six thousand years. Yet it has been thus preserved, managed, and kept in its regular motions for six thousand years without a single collision or accident! Is this all chance?

But the matter in hand is to look at the possibility and probability of the world being burned up.

Scientific men have long since demonstrated that even water, which we use to extinguish fire, may be placed under such conditions as to cause it to burn with a fury and intensity surpassing all human imagination. The same is true, also, of the atmosphere itself. As easy, then, as you move the regulator of your watch, he who created the heavens and the earth, the sea and land, and all things, and upholds them by the word of his power, can place the water under such conditions, as well as the air, as would convert it into the most inflammable material, and thus wrap this globe in flame—*immerse it in fire.* It is not argued here that the world *will certainly* be destroyed in this way, but surely this is a very *possible way.*

But stop and look from another angle. See the smith

bring a heated iron in contact with one drop of water, sufficient to evaporate it instantly, and the result is equal to the firing of a pistol. Suppose you could bring a heated mass of any sort in contact with one pint of water, sufficient to evaporate it instantly, what would be the result? A concussion more terrible than the explosion of the greatest shell ever fired from a mortar! Suppose, then, that power, such as lifts continents from the bed of the ocean, and rears mountains five miles above the level of the ocean, should instantly make an opening some three or four thousand miles in length under the depths of the ocean, through the crust of the earth, thus instantly letting the great waters into the boiling lava, what kind of a result might be expected? Certainly not a mere earthquake, jarring the earth for thousands of miles, as is occasioned by volcanic eruptions, but an explosion that would hurl atoms of the earth thousands of miles out from the globe, when, by attraction or gravitation, they would be drawn back to the center, forming a universal chaos.

Please take one more look. Man has not been able to penetrate but a short distance into the earth, probably not three thousand feet. What has been found in the little space so far penetrated? Most fearful material. Gas has been found, which has rushed out of the small hole made in boring sufficient to charge the air for hundreds of yards round, which has caught on fire, and, in a few instances, burned men to death before they could escape. This is a mere index to what may be treasured up deeper down. Who knows what engines of destruction the Lord may have still below the limited space penetrated by man? There may be vast reservoirs of this wonderful gas, sufficient to charge the entire atmosphere belonging to the globe and supply the fuel, after one universal flame shall spread and extend as far as the atmosphere itself, as long as the

flood prevailed on the earth, thus devouring every living creature on the face of the earth. Who knows what the Almighty has locked up deep down, far below where man has never penetrated? There may be vast oceans of this fearful gas lying far below even the bed of the sea, and nothing but the fiat of the Infinite One is required to bring it to the surface and spread universal flame all over the great waters and the dry lands.

Shall ignorant men, then, in the hardness of their hearts and their determined perversity, dare to question the possibility of the destruction of the world by fire? Even looking at it in view of what little man knows of its structure, and the wonderful resources and engines the Lord has in it and on it, and contemplating the natural causes and effects, the wonder, as has been before stated, is not *how it can be destroyed by fire,* but *how the Lord has kept it from destruction and made it a safe habitation for man for six thousand years!*

It is not maintained here that the Lord will destroy the world by means of this gas, or by means of the vast lake of fire supposed to be within the bowels of the earth; nor is it claimed that any man can tell, or even knows, what means the Lord will employ, what engines or resources he will use in fulfilling the word of prophecy; nor is such a reference, as has been here made, necessary for any man that believes his Bible. It is only made for the sake of men who do not believe the Bible, to show them that, aside from all revelation on the subject, such an event as the Bible predicts is as probable as any thing. Instead of its being *unreasonable* or *impossible* for the world to be destroyed by fire, it is as probable and reasonable as any thing. But for the man who believes the Bible, or that believes that God is the self-existent and unoriginated cause of all things, or that he created all things, no such reasoning is necessary, for cer-

tainly he who created all things, actually brought them into existence, can immerse the world in water or flame at his pleasure. It will require a miracle, and no man need inquire *how* a miracle is done, or can be done. *How* the Almighty created man—brought into existence the human race—*how* he created heaven, and earth, and all things—how he put in motion the immense bodies in the heavens and governs them in their vast orbits, no man of intelligence will attempt to explain. So no man of intelligence ought to think of explaining how the Almighty produced the flood, or how he will produce the fire that shall destroy the world. The man of faith doubts not because he sees not how it will be performed. He has no doubt that God will raise the dead, though he sees not how it will be done. If a man can be born, grow up, and become a full-grown man in twenty-one years, under the power of God vested in the laws of nature, it will be no more wonderful for the same power of God, put forth in another way, to instantly raise a man from the dead.

It is, then, good for us occasionally to think of the vast resources in the hands of the Almighty Father of heaven and earth for overflowing the world with water, immersing it in fire, or doing whatever he may please to do with the world or man, to bring us to a realization of our nothingness, our insignificance, and the feebleness of our reasonings, that we may stand off and admire the stupendous proportions and immeasurable dimensions of the "wonderful works of God." In view of all this, how men should sink in the depths of humility before God and exclaim, with David, "Lord, what then is man, that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him?" Come, then, you men of faith, men of the Bible, men of God, and hear the destiny of the world. What does the Bible say? Hear a few words from the Old Testament: "Behold the day

comes, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that comes shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Mal. iv: 1. "To you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired by all them that believe." 2 Thess. i: 7–10. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing, then, that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons you ought to be in all holy behavior and godliness; looking for and hasting to the day of God, wherein the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?" 2 Pet. iii: 10–12. Let no unbelief come nigh thy dwelling, nor stagger at the wonderful prophetic statements of these Scriptures, but tremble before the Majesty of heaven and earth.

Do you inquire for the power to accomplish all this? Peter says, of our Lord Jesus the Christ, that he "has gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, authorities, and powers being made subject to him." See 1 Pet. iii: 22. The angels, authorities, and powers are subject to our Lord. Paul says, 2 Thess. i: 7, that "he shall be revealed with his mighty angels." We read, Matt. xxv: 31, that "the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him." He will literally have at his command the "armies in heaven." Look, then, for one

moment, at the august messages executed by these wonderful beings, "greater in power and might" than man. One of them in a single hour—the hour of midnight—struck down in death the first-born in every house in all Egypt where the blood was not sprinkled on the door-posts. An angel descended on the morning of the resurrection of Jesus, rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulcher, and sat on it, while the Roman guard "fell on the ground as dead men." Two angels visited Sodom, warned Lot to leave the place, and spread down one vast sheet of fire, and swept away the cities of the plains to rise no more forever. These samples are sufficient to indicate the wonderful power of these swift messengers of Jehovah, when dispatched to execute the terrible judgments of God. What, then, may we expect when the Lord shall "come, with all the holy angels," to execute judgment on all them who obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ?

But if this world is to be immersed in fire—to "be burned up," where will the saints be during the general conflagration? The Lord has not left them in the dark on this subject, but has revealed a way of escape. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we, who are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv: 14–16. The expression "the dead in Christ shall rise first" has, doubtless, in many instances, been taken wrong. It has generally been taken to mean that "the dead in Christ shall rise first," or before the wicked. But this is not the meaning of it. The two classes of which he is speaking are not the righteous and wicked, but "the dead in Christ," or, figuratively, "those who sleep in Jesus," and those who "are alive and remain

at the coming of the Lord." This latter class shall not anticipate or go before those who have died in Christ, but those who sleep in Jesus shall rise first, before the living saints shall be changed, and ascend to meet him in the air; and, together, the two classes shall go up to meet the Lord, and forever be with him. This, then, obviates all difficulty as to the safety of the saints when the general destruction shall come. The Lord will take care of them—take them up to be forever with him.

What a scene must have been witnessed when the flood came, and "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished;" when "the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered," "and the mountains were covered," "and all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was on the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and the cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth; and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark!" The Lord—Matt. xxiv: 37–39—describes them as follows: "But as the days of Noah were, shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, till the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not till the flood came and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." When "all the fountains of the great deep were broken up" and "the windows of heaven were opened," and the waters prevailed and commenced overspreading the dry land; when dwellings and all kinds of property, with man and beast,

were being swept away, what awful terror was sent forth into the hearts of wicked and rebellious men! The long-suffering of God had been waiting. For one hundred and twenty years the solemn warnings of the preacher of righteousness had been despised, his honest pleadings and exhortations contemned, and he had been rejected. The wickedness of man was very great on the earth. Unbelief, blindness, and hardness of heart prevailed to such an extent that reformation was impossible. The goodness of God was despised, his forbearance and long-suffering had been construed into evidence that his judgments lingered. Some were seeking fame and renown; others were in the general scramble for riches; some seeking revenge, and gratifying their hate on their enemies; others in general debauchery and the depths of corruption. They had long been filling up the cup of iniquity. It was now full. They had been treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath. The day of vengeance had been long coming, but no less sure. It had now come, and the threatened destruction came. A race that had been multiplying for sixteen long centuries was swept away in fury and wrath, excepting eight souls, on account of their rebellion against God, and the account of it is entered on the sacred records as a warning to the generations to come.

The apostle says: "By the same word the heavens and the earth which are now are kept in store, reserved to fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." For eighteen long centuries has the wrath of God been kindling and treasuring up against the day of wrath, and the righteous judgment of God against them who know not God and obey not the Gospel. His transcendent forbearance, compassion, and mercy are now, by hardened men, being construed to mean that he will never come; that judgment will never overtake the disobedient, and the world

will never be destroyed. Be not deceived, blinded, nor deluded. The Lord is not slack concerning his promises or threatenings. The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, and retribution will be awarded.

How utterly wonderful, when the waywardness of the human race in all the past generations is considered, that the forbearance and long-suffering of God should have extended six thousand years; that the love of God to man, as displayed through our Lord Jesus the Christ, should have been extended for eighteen long centuries, while our God has been all the time extending his hands in mercy and in infinite compassion, in gracious invitations to return and live. Though the love of God has been despised, the agonies of the Savior in the garden of Gethsemane have been contemned, the sufferings of Jesus on the cross have been unheeded by millions on millions of our ungrateful and wayward race, his streaming blood to cleanse us from sin has been set at naught for many long centuries, the wonderful forbearance of God is still extended, and the nations are still invited to the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world! In infinite compassion, he still stands all the day long, in most lovely strains, inviting the children of men to return. Who can appreciate, much less express his appreciation of the mercy, the grace, and compassion of the Almighty Father, in bearing with the waywardness, the transgressions, and the corruptions of the children of men down through all the generations of the past, or the everlasting debt of gratitude that we owe? But we are not to infer, from the long forbearance of God, that the day of wrath will never come, or that the judgment of God will never overtake the ungodly. The day of wrath overtook the ungodly in the time of Noah. The flood came and swept them all away. The Egyptians, with their hardened and blinded monarch, were hurled down, in terrible wrath

and fury, in the Red Sea. The Sodomites were destroyed from the face of the earth by the devouring flames. One million and a half of Jews fell in the siege in Jerusalem, and their blood ran ankle-deep in the streets of the devoted city. Shall all these displays in the judgments of God go unheeded by the people of our time, and shall they join in the stupid delusion that "all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation?" Shall their eyes be closed against the calamities that have been brought on the ungodly in past ages, not knowing that the most terrible judgment of all is approaching? Be warned and entreated, then, to turn to the Lord before the day of vengeance shall come—before the terrible announcement shall be made that "time shall be no longer," but eternity, with all its solemnities and realities, shall be ushered in. May we find mercy of the Lord in that day!

"To Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood," be honor and power everlasting!

SERMON, No. XIX.

THEME.—THE THREE STATES OF MAN—THE FLESHLY, THE INTERMEDIATE AND THE ETERNAL.

TEXT—"What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?"—HEB. ii: 6.

THIS language is quoted by Paul from David, Ps. viii: 4. We have our grand questions in agriculture, commerce, and politics; in arts, sciences, and improvements, all having their comparative importance, interest, and consequences; but all these questions sink into insignificance, emptiness, and nothingness in view of the momentous question, "What is man?" David says: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?" This shows that he had just been viewing the heavens, considering the vastness, stupendous proportions, and magnitude of the wonderful works of God that appear in the heavens above us; and, in contrast with all that appeared to him, his mind reverts to man, and he bursts forth in the inquiry, "What is man?" In view, too, of all these wonderful works that he considered in the heavens, from the hand of God, he is overwhelmed that God should stoop to be mindful of man, or the son of man, to visit him! This is wonderful, beyond all human comprehension; but that our heavenly Father

should number even the hairs of the heads of his saints, as the Lord assures us he does, is superlatively encouraging, consoling, and comforting, and is sufficient to call out everlasting gratitude and thanksgiving from the children of men. Is it so, that he who made all things—who made and upholds the worlds by the word of his mighty power, condescends to number even the hairs on the heads of his saints, and that not even a sparrow falls to the ground without his notice? This is all true. Our heavenly Father is, then, infinitely good, and man is of much more value than many sparrows. This, then, opens the way to inquire into the question, "What is man?" in three states:

1. What is man in the present or fleshly state?

2. What is man in the intermediate state, or between death and the resurrection?

3. What is man in the eternal or resurrection state?

These are questions to be settled by revelation. All science, philosophy, and reasoning, aside from revelation, must forever fail to answer these great questions concerning man. Men of the world—some of them scientific men—have talked much of the "light of nature" and "the book of nature," but no "light of nature" nor "book of nature" can answer any one of these questions. There is no light in nature even to reveal God to man, or man to himself, much less to tell *what man is* in any one of the three states in question. To proceed, then, at once to the matter in hand, let it be distinctly understood what is in view, and what is to be accomplished in the examination of the subject in hand.

The system, plan, or scheme of redemption is unique, there being a complete and perfect symmetry in all its parts. The man who humanizes the Savior of the world, as some Unitarians and Humanitarians do, lets down the whole system, in all its parts, to the same level. In precisely the same way, the man who lowers down man to a mere animal,

a material being, a *thinking* lump of matter, lowers down the whole system in the same proportion all round. It is a matter to be deeply regretted, that any human being of ordinary intelligence should *degrade himself*, and *try* to degrade his race so far as to maintain that man is composed wholly of matter; that when a man dies, as one expresses it, "he dies all over;" or, as another expresses it, "he is unmade;" or, as another has it, "he is decomposed," and no more exists as a man than he did a thousand years before he was created. Still, we have the men in our day who have thus degraded themselves, and are thus carnalizing the gracious system which God has ordained for our salvation. These maintain that man has no conscious existence between death and the resurrection; that after the resurrection all, both good and bad, will appear in the final judgment, when the wicked will be killed again, or decomposed, and have no conscious existence forever. In other words, they maintain that the entire man is *mortal*, and assume that, at death, his conscious existence terminates till raised from the dead; and after the last judgment, the conscious existence of the wicked will be terminated forever, and the righteous will be immortalized. Reference is here made to this theory that all may see what becomes of it, when the light of revelation is opened out on it. Without further preliminary, turn your attention to the matters in hand.

What is man in the present or fleshly state? Paul says, "And may your spirit, and soul, and body be preserved whole without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thess. v: 23. This is the Bible Union reading. To get the passage fully into view, read the verse from the beginning from the common version: "And the very God of peace sanctify you fully; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." From this passage it

is clear that the man wholly consists of a "whole spirit, and soul, and body." It matters not whether we can clearly and perfectly distinguish between the "whole spirit, and soul, and body" or not, nor whether we can fully understand the union of a "whole spirit, and soul, and body" in one person; nor whether we can understand all about what pertains to the whole spirit, the whole soul, or the whole body, still there is the fact that the Divine Spirit of all wisdom and all revelation recognized in man a "whole spirit, and soul, and body," or recognized in man a *triune being*, a *trinity*, a being consisting of a "whole spirit, and soul, and body." This threefold or triune nature of man is never lost sight of in the entire revelation from God to man.

It is useless to stop and stumble ourselves because we can not understand all about this triune nature. We can not understand all about any thing. We only understand in part; but the Lord understands, and when he speaks of a "whole spirit, and soul, and body," he means something. There is a clear intimation of the same kind in the Mosaic account of the creation: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. ii: 7. The word "man" here is used metonymically; the whole is evidently used for a part. It was only the body that was "formed of the dust," a perfect corporeal human structure, or a perfect human body; but it was lifeless, motionless, and powerless. This is clear from what follows: "And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." The body was formed, but before the Lord breathed into it the breath of life it did not breathe nor live. But after he breathed into it the breath of life, it lived and breathed. He became, what he was not before, a living soul, or a living being or person.

But that we may see more fully what man is, hear the Lord: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. x: 28. Here the Lord, alluding to the persecutors, says they "kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Here is not only a distinction made between the *soul* and *body*, but two different things are stated—one of the soul and the other of the body. 1. Man can kill the body. 2. Man can not kill the soul. The following is clear from this:

1. There is a clear distinction between the soul and the body.

2. That the death of the body is not the death of the whole man—is not the death of the soul.

3. That the soul does not die when the body dies.

4. That man can kill the body.

5. That man can not kill the soul.

There is no far-fetched reasoning here. As certainly as the Lord spoke truth, man is "not able to kill the soul." Man is able to kill the body. The body, then, dies, while the soul does not. The material man can be killed by man, but the soul, or "inner man"—the immaterial man—can not be killed by man.

The Sadducees did not believe in the existence of angels or spirits, and, to be consistent, denied the resurrection of the dead. They believed they were invincible in argument. They were ever ready for debate with their opposers, the Pharisees. They learned that the Lord had indorsed the Pharisees, so far as the question of the resurrection was concerned. The Sadducees regarded this as a fine opening for them. They considered themselves invulnerable on this question. Accordingly, they prepared to meet Jesus on their favorite point of discussion. They studied out one of their greatest difficulties, and presented it to him. Probably they

had puzzled their former antagonists with it many times. They selected the puzzling case of the woman who had married seven men in succession, who had all died, and the woman also had died, and inquired which one of the seven should have her in the resurrection. This was as difficult as any of the subtleties produced by the caviling and captious from that time to the present. But the Lord solved their difficult problem in a single sentence, as follows: "In that world they neither marry nor are given in marriage." In that respect "they are as the angels of God." So much for their puzzling question; but now he proceeds to give them a further lesson: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calls the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live to him." Luke xx: 37, 38. Here we have an argument from our Lord, showing that the dead shall be raised. What is the argument? It is as follows: God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He is not the God of the dead, but of the living. How is he, then, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, seeing that they are dead? They are dead *to us*, but alive *to him:* for all *live to him.* Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though dead to us, *live to God.* This proves the existence of human spirits, and that they live to God after death, which was denied by the Sadducee; and which, if proved to him, settled the question of the resurrection of the dead. The Lord affirms that the dead shall rise, and maintains that Moses showed this in declaring that God is the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; which, as he is not the God of the dead, proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob live to him, for, says Jesus, "all live to him;" and thus settles the question of human existence after death, or spiritual existence after death, which proved the resurrection to the Sadducee. This settles the

main question in this discourse, as it shows that Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, who had died to this world and all that is in it many ages before, still lived to God—were still in conscious existence; thus showing that there is a conscious existence between death and the resurrection—that during this period persons *live to God.*

Please turn to that grand and sublime event called "the transfiguration." What did the transfiguration consist of? The Lord appeared in divine majesty, as he would if we could see him now, glorified, highly exalted, and crowned Lord of all, as he sits on the throne in heaven. There were three representatives there, or eye-witnesses in the flesh or from the fleshly state, viz., Peter, James, and John. There was one representative there from the intermediate state, or the state between death and the resurrection, viz., Moses. There was also one representative there from the eternal state, or from the resurrection state, viz., Elijah. This was the most august and sublime scene that ever appeared to mortal eyes. Peter, James, and John were there as witnesses. The Almighty Father there showed their Lord and King as he would appear to us if we could see him as he is now in heaven, thus enabling them to say, "We were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when such a voice came to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice we heard from heaven, being with him in the holy mount." 2 Pet. i: 17. They saw the glorified and highly exalted Lord, and heard the wonderful voice from the excellent glory.

But they saw another distinguished personage there. Moses was there. Yes, Moses, the mediator of the First Testament was there; the man Moses, after he had died, been absent from this world fifteen hundred years, and his body had been mingled with the dust. Moses appears, is

identified, and spoken of by name. He is there, separate from the body, for Christ was the first-born from the dead, of every creature, and he was not born from the dead then. What a grand matter! A man who had disappeared from this world for fifteen centuries, re-appears, is identified, his former life and character identified with him; separate from the body, but in a conscious state, and holds a conversation with our Lord in regard to his sufferings to be accomplished at Jerusalem! The mediator of the Old Testament in a conversation with the Mediator of the New Testament, as if coming to him to resign his authority as lawgiver, and hand all over into the hands of the new Lawgiver. What a grand occasion! He represented the intermediate state.

But there was yet another distinguished personage there. The ancient prophet Elijah was there, a representative of the eternal or resurrection state. He did not suffer death. Many long centuries before, standing on the east side of the Jordan, surrounded by the multitude, he entered the chariot of God, and, as the hosts of Israel stood gazing after him, he ascended to God. As he was wafted triumphantly toward heaven, he threw off his mantle, and it fell on Elisha. He was changed, glorified, immortalized, and happified, and thus shown to Peter, James, and John, a specimen of redeemed, immortalized, and happified humanity. They saw him, too, participating in the conversation touching the Lord's sufferings to be accomplished in Jerusalem. We have, then, the testimony of these witnesses of Jesus, who saw his Divine Majesty, to the conscious existence of Moses, between death and the resurrection, and to the conscious existence of Elijah, in the eternal state. They were both present and participated in the conversation with our Lord.

The next scripture to which your attention is directed, is the case of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi: 19–31. It may be said, "That is only a parable." How do you

know that it is a parable? "It says," exclaims a man, "in my Bible, at the head of the chapter, 'The Parable of the rich man and Lazarus.'" That is the case with many Bibles; but how came that heading there? All know, or ought to know, that that heading, and, indeed, all the headings are modern, and utterly without Divine authority. The purpose of them is merely for convenience, in finding passages of Scripture. There is not only no authority for heading this passage as it is, or at all, but the heading alluded to is manifestly erroneous. It is no parable at all, but a statement of an actual case. This is evident from the wording of it. It is introduced by stating, "There was a certain rich man." This is too particular for a parable, or a supposed or hypothetical case. It points to a particular person. It is not "There was a rich man," but "There was a *certain* rich man." And then, on the other hand, it is not merely "There was a beggar," but "a *certain* beggar," pointing to a particular person. Then the Lord adds, "whose name was Lazarus;" thus giving the proper name of the "certain" person of whom he is speaking. Some have argued that "Lazarus" means *poor*. True, it has that meaning *now*, but it had not *then*. The probability is that that meaning was derived from this very case. But any one can see that the word is not used in that sense. It is not "There was a certain beggar, who was Lazarus," but "*whose name* was Lazarus," or, more abbreviated, "named Lazarus." The statement of the case has every appearance of a *real case*, or an *actual case*, which the Lord knew to exist.

But, not to argue the case, and for the sake of any one who may not be convinced that it is an actual case, but a supposed or hypothetical case, let it be observed that this will not in the least militate against the argument. The Lord did not suppose a case that would never occur. If he supposed a case, it was all founded in reality. This is the

case with all types and shadows. They all have their foundation in reality. There never was a shadow without a substance. There never was a counterfeit without a genuine. All counterfeits are imitations of the genuine. There never would have been a counterfeit dollar if there had not been a genuine dollar. Even the false is evidence of the true. Every false god is an evidence of the true God. There never could have been a false god if there had not been a true God. There never could have been a false or counterfeit priest, if there had not been a true or genuine priest. The false is an imitation of the genuine. The false professor of religion is an imitation of the genuine, and proof of the existence of the genuine. The false professor is an attempted imitation of the genuine, but not the genuine, but an indisputable proof of the genuine.

All the parables of our Lord are founded in reality. He never would have said "I am the vine; you are the branches," if there had not been a real vine and branches. He never would have said "The kingdom of God is like a fish-net," if there had not been a real fish-net. But in the case in hand, he does not say that one thing is like another, or something is like "a certain rich man," but "There *was a certain* rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day." This "certain rich man" "died, and in hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." Supposed, or a real case, the conscious existence after death is found in it. He is in "torments" after death. The beggar died, and was borne away by the angels to Abraham's bosom, and is comforted. Here, again, we have conscious existence after death. The rich man, after death, is in "torments," and Lazarus is "comforted." They are both in *conscious existence.* Their identity is retained. The rich man sees Lazarus and recognizes him. They are not in the same place. Lazarus is in Abraham's bosom;

the rich man is in another place, "far off;" a "great gulf between them," so that they "can not pass" from one place to the other. The rich man is in "torments," and Lazarus is "comforted." This is a wide difference and a wonderful change in situations from that which existed before death.

Much darkness exists touching the conditions and states after death, on account of the obscurity in the translation in common use. The three Greek words, *gehenna*, *hades*, and *tartarus* are represented by the one English word *hell*. These three Greek words evidently do not mean the same thing. In the sense of the Greeks, *hades* means the *invisible*, or, as the Bible Union renders it, "*under-world*." It includes all the dead between death and the resurrection. Paradise, or Abraham's bosom, does not mean the same as *hades*. It is included in *hades*, but only contains the righteous between death and the resurrection. In the same way, *tartarus* does not mean the same as *hades*. It is included in *hades*, but only contains the wicked between death and the resurrection. The rich man, though in *hades*, was also in *tartarus;* and Lazarus, though also in *hades*, was in Abraham's bosom, or, literally, in *paradise*, and there was a great gulf between them. But neither of them was in *gehenna*. *Gehenna* is beyond the resurrection, the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels. The wicked, after the eternal judgment, will be cast into the *gehenna* of fire prepared for the devil and his angels, "where the worm dies not, and the fire is not quenched." This is the final doom of the wicked. When the saints die, they go to paradise, and enjoy a state of rest or comfort till the resurrection. When the wicked die, they go to tartarus, to a "place of torment," where they remain till the resurrection. After the final judgment, the wicked go into *gehenna*, and the righteous into heaven, to remain forever. This will be discussed more fully further on.

One other matter of importance appears here, and that is, that the rich man desired that Lazarus should be sent to his five brothers, "to testify to them that they come not also into this place of torment." See Luke xvi: 28. Men are now maintaining that spirits are coming back from the dead and converting people. The great apostle of infidelity, it is claimed, was convinced of the existence of God by visitations from departed spirits, after all the testimony of the apostles and prophets had failed to convince him. Here, then, is a case in hand. The rich man applies, finding himself, after death, in a "place of torment," and intercedes for one from the dead, to be sent to testify to his five brothers, that they come not also to this "place of torment." Is one sent from the dead to convince them who would not believe Moses and the prophets? Certainly not. This would be to admit that the testimony of Moses and the prophets was insufficient. "Abraham says to him: They have Moses and the prophets: let them hear them." The rich man presses the case: "Nay, father Abraham; if one shall go to them from the dead, they will repent." Abraham replies: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one should rise from the dead." Here, then, is the clear proof that God does not permit the dead to return to convince the living. Here, also, is the clear statement, that if they would not hear Moses and the prophets, they would not be persuaded if one would rise from the dead. This ought to be an everlasting quietus, and is with those who believe the Bible, touching departed spirits returning and converting their surviving friends.

The very idea of our returning from the dead and converting persons who could not be converted by all the divine testimonies of Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, is supremely ridiculous. It is taking the position that de-

parted human spirits could achieve more in turning sinners to God and saving them, than Moses and the prophets, and Jesus and the apostles. This is clothed with an affrontery, an arrogance, and absurdity almost unequaled. A few "table-tippers," "spirit-rappers," "spirit-mediums," or, in other words, persons possessed by unclean spirits, assuming to convince people who could not be convinced by either the mediator of the first, or the Mediator of the second covenant, Moses or Jesus, the prophets or apostles, is certainly the climax of absurdity! Then the *convinced people*, under this new system of *mediation, spirit-mediation, human* spirit-mediation, who could not be convinced by the *divine* mediation of him who was with God, and who was God; in whom dwells all the fullness of the Deity bodily, what a set of convinced people they are! What do they believe, now that they are convinced? They believe nothing, and are nothing but wandering stars, raging waves of the sea, clouds without rain, unstable souls—mere subjects of duplicity. They have not a redeeming quality, not an element to commend them or their teaching to a soul of our race. They have despised, rejected, and turned away from the Mediator of the New Testament, and are now seeking the mediation of human spirits of the dead! How transcendently ridiculous and absurd! This is only equaled by king Saul, turning away from the commandment of God, and seeking light from "the woman of Endor."

Paul says: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Who is this "we" that has our earthly house of the tabernacle"—or of the body, which is the meaning of it—and who has "a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens?" See 2 Cor. v: 1. Is not this the being, the personality? "For," says the apostle, "in this we

groan, longing to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: seeing that we should be found clothed, not naked." The *person* or the "we" in the tabernacle, is not the tabernacle or the body, but the tenant in the body. He proceeds: "Now he who has wrought us for this very thing is God, who also gave to us the earnest of the Spirit. Being, therefore, always confident, and knowing that while at home in the body we are absent from the Lord, (for we walk by faith, not by sight,) we are confident, and are well pleased rather to leave our home in the body, and to be at home with the Lord." "We," the person, the being, may be "at home in the body," or "may leave our home in the body, and be at home with the Lord;" or, as it is in the common version, *present* with the Lord. When we die, we leave home in the body; are absent from the body, and at home, or present with the Lord.

Shall we hear the apostle again? "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not: God knows,) such a one caught up even to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body or without the body, I know not: God knows,) that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." 2 Cor. xii: 2–4. The apostle here states what he knew as a matter of fact, and what he did not know. What did he know? 1. He knew a man in Christ. 2. That such an one, above fourteen years ago (when Paul wrote), was caught up to the third heaven—to paradise. 3. That he heard unspeakable things, not lawful to utter. These things he knew. What, then, did he not know? He did not know whether the man was caught away to paradise in the body or out of the body. Two things are clearly involved here: 1. That the man of whom Paul speaks was not *the body*, but *dwelt in the body*. 2.

That the man could have been caught away to paradise *in the body*. 3. That the man could have been caught away to paradise *out of the body*. Then it follows, also, that a man can see, hear, and remember out of, or separate from, the body; or that a man may be separate from the body and be conscious; or that a man may be cognizant of things transpiring around him, separate from the body. This perfectly accords with another saying of the apostle, found 2 Cor. iv: 16: "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perishes, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." The "outward man" is the body. Though it perishes, the "inward man," who dwells in the body, is renewed day by day. While the body is becoming enfeebled, weaker, and decaying, the "inner man," the spiritual man, is continually being renewed, invigorated, and sustained; and when the body dies, the "inner man" absents himself from the body, leaves the home in the body, and is present, or at home with the Lord.

This shows that *life* and *death* do not mean merely *existence* and *non-existence*, and that *eternal* life and the *second* death do not mean merely *eternal existence* and *eternal non-existence*, but that life and death have reference to *two states of existence;* so eternal life and the second death have reference to two states of existence—the one a state of existence in happiness, and the other a state of existence in punishment. This is clearly taught in other scriptures. For instance: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Here is "eternal life" in contrast with "everlasting punishment." The original Greek word *aionion*, translated "eternal" on the one hand, is translated "everlasting" on the other. At the *same time* the righteous enter into eternal life, the wicked enter into everlasting punishment. Entering into "eternal life" here can not be entering into *eternal existence*, for

they were already in existence; and if that existence was to be continued eternally, still they were *already in it*, and could not enter *into* that which they were already *in*. Nor could it mean entering into eternal *conscious* existence; for they were already in *conscious* existence, and could not enter *into* that which they were already *in*. If they were already in conscious existence, and it was to be eternal, they could not enter into it. To make "eternal life" there mean eternal existence, or eternal conscious existence, is to do away with all idea of their *entering into it;* for they were already *in* existence, and conscious existence; and if that existence is *eternal*, they were already in eternal existence. Then there is no such thing as "going away into everlasting non-existence." This would be utterly senseless. As we can think of and understand the *commencement* of existence, so can we understand the *termination* of existence; or, as we can understand *bringing into* existence, we can understand going *out of existence;* or, as we can understand the Lord *giving* existence, we can understand the *taking* existence.

The Lord said to the thief on the cross: "To-day, I say to you, shall you be with me in paradise." Paradise never means the grave. Nor does it ever mean the state of the dead in general, of all classes, but is limited exclusively to the saved. While it was true that both our Lord and the thief were to die that day, it was not true that they were going out of conscious existence, or that the entire beings were going into their graves, but they were that day to be *in paradise*. King David, the Psalmist of Israel, when his child died, said, "He can not come to me: I shall go to him." John says: "I saw under the altar the souls of them who were beheaded for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus; and they cried and said, How long, O Lord God Almighty, holy, just, and true, dost thou not avenge

us of our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" What did he see under the altar? Not the *bodies*, but the *souls* of them who were beheaded for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus. These were *souls after death*. Do you say this was only a figurative representation shown to John in vision? A figurative representation of what? Of something that had no existence? A figurative representation of *souls*, visible, under the altar; conscious, and crying to heaven for vengeance after death, when souls are to have no conscious existence after death? Would God represent something figuratively that had no existence? No; such a thing is absurd. It was in vision, representing not things that *had no existence*, but grand and sublime realities that *had existence*. No matter, so far as the argument is concerned, whether John *literally* saw the souls of them that were beheaded, or the Lord represented them to him in vision. If he *literally saw* souls under the altar, and heard them crying, and understood what they cried after death, it settles the question of conscious existence between death and the resurrection, or the conscious existence of the souls of men, separate from the bodies, after death. From this there is no escape. If the Lord represented this to John in vision, it settles the same thing, unless he represented something that had no existence. To say this is infidelity. The Lord represented *realities, things that existed*, and not myths, having no existence. Souls have conscious existence separate from their bodies; and are waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their bodies, or the resurrection of their bodies from the dead.

The stupendous works of the Almighty Father of heaven and earth in creation were grand. So are his works wonderful, grand, and sublime in providence. But what shall be said, and what shall be thought, of his stupendous work in the ransom of the bodies of the children of men from

the grave? What shall we say or think, or what can we say of the grand transaction, when God, by the Spirit of Christ that dwells in the saints, shall quicken their *mortal bodies*, or make their mortal bodies alive and raise them up from the dead; when the sea shall yield up the dead bodies that are in it; when the graves of all the earth shall give up the dead bodies; when death itself shall be despoiled of its power, and yield up all the dead so long held down under its awful grasp, and hades shall release and deliver up all its subjects; when we shall see them coming from the four quarters of the earth, and assembling in the eternal judgment; when the books shall be opened, and another book shall be opened, which is the book of life; and the dead shall be judged out of the things written in the books, according to their works? This will be the last meeting, and after it will follow the last separation. After the final judgment, the separation shall take place: "He shall divide them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats," as the Lord describes—Matt. xxv: 32—setting the one class on his right hand, and the other on his left. Those whose names shall not be found in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire, as described Rev. xx: 14; "into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," as described by the Lord himself, Matt. xxv: 41; into the *gehenna*, where the fire shall never be quenched, and the worm shall never die. This is the second death. This is the last account of those who obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; of those who can not be won to Christ by all his love, his compassion, his merciful entreaties; by all his agonies in the garden, his wonderful sufferings on the cross, his streaming blood; by his holy life, his prayers and tears; by the holy efforts of all the saints, their prayers and tears; by the reasonings, persuasions, and warnings of their dying friends. This is the last account, the last

trace of those whom we can not bring to God. We have wept over them, prayed over them, and grieved over them. We have exhausted our last resources, made our last efforts, and have been compelled to yield the point. The last and best appeal of heaven has been made and failed. They have turned away from it all, and dashed the cup of salvation from their lips, and rejected the Savior of the world. On their part all is lost. They are ruined forever. They are turned away from God, who loved them; from the Savior, who died for them; from the angels, who waited to have ministered to them had they come to God; from the saints, who prayed, wept over them, and tried to save them; from all that is good, and pure, and holy, and are cast off forever. The saints give them up, like they do their friends in death, because they can do no more for them. They would not go with the children of God. They would not be reconciled to God. They determined to have their own way. They chose the wicked for their associates while in this world, and now are compelled to have them, with the devil and his angels, for their associates forever. They are abandoned forever. No saint in the whole kingdom desires to follow them any further, but all lament that they could not save them.

Turning to a more pleasing theme, what account have we of the saints after the resurrection? Their Lord and Redeemer shall say to them, "Come, blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." "Well done, good and faithful; enter into the joys of our Lord." Then will they be seen coming, in the immortal splendors of the New Jerusalem, with crowns on their heads, palms of victory in their hands, and songs of everlasting joys on their lips, in the grand procession, which no man could number. Who can comprehend the stupendous procession when the mighty hosts of Israel of

old, the most formidable column of humanity ever seen on the face of the earth, with Moses, the mediator of the first covenant, at their head, moved forward in crossing the Red Sea, out of Egyptian bondage, and the strains of praises that rose to heaven in view of a nation's freedom from most oppressive bondage? No one can comprehend this. What, then, must be our best effort to comprehend the imposing, stupendous, and sublime scenes, when the great assembly which John saw, which no man could number, from every nation, kindred, tribe, tongue, and people, in one grand and imposing column shall move forward to the gate of the everlasting city, and the doors shall fly wide, and the everlasting gates shall be lifted up, and the King of glory shall again come in and be welcomed by all the mighty hierarchs of the upper world? What must our best efforts be to comprehend, much less describe, the mighty procession, as it shall move forward, with the Mediator of the new covenant and their Redeemer in front, and exclaiming, "Father, here am I, and here are the children thou hast given me!" and when they shall chime in and unite in the grand song of "Blessing, and glory, and honor, and power, and dominion, to the Lord our God?" Then shall what was shown to John in *vision* appear in reality. He says: "And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the sound of many waters, and as the sound of mighty thunders, saying: Alleluia; because the Lord God the Almighty reigns. Let us rejoice and exult, and we will give to him the glory; because the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife made herself ready. And it was given to her that she should be clothed in fine linen, pure and shining; for the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints." "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and GOD WITH THEM himself shall be their God. And he shall wipe away all tears from

their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor shall mourning, nor crying, nor pain, be any more: because the former things are passed away. And he who sat on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he says, Write; because these words are faithful and true."

What a gloom was cast over the earth when man sinned. The world was condemned, and the sentence of death passed upon all! For six thousand years the executioner has been doing his work, inflicting the death penalty. No way of escape has been found. The inflexible law has gone forth: *You shall surely die.* There is no alternative. This penalty can not be revoked. But the Lord has come, and followed the condemned to the execution, and beyond it: "I will ransom them from the grave." After the penalty has been inflicted, I will raise man from the dead, and those whose names are enrolled in the book of life shall be robed in white, and walk with me in the streets of the New Jerusalem, for they are worthy. What a grand triumph, when they shall shout, "O, death, where now is thy sting? O, hades, where now is thy victory?" They can then look back to death and shout the victory: We are free from your darts and missiles forever! and look back to hades and exclaim, We are free from your prison-house forever! Our great Deliverer has cleansed our souls from sin, in his own blood, and, by his omnipotent power, raised us from the dead and freed us from the fetters of the grave forever. He has lifted us up and seated us at his own right hand in the holy city, and has given us riches, and glories, and honors, transcending all human description. He has permitted us to join the grand throng who shall walk the golden streets, and unite in the celestial songs forever and ever. We shall never sin any more, and never have to hang our heads in shame, confess and beg for pardon. But with the angels of God, the pure and the holy, the just and the true;

in the presence of our Father and our God, with our most gracious Lord, who has redeemed us, dwell forever and ever.

The Lord Jesus, the stone rejected by the Jewish builders, but the chief, or arch, in the foundation which God laid; the head over all things to the Church; in whom all fullness dwells, who has been the grand center of attraction of our afflictions; the chief among all the ten thousands and altogether lovely, will then dwell in our midst, honored and admired by all the upper world. Those who loved him here will love him there, and be like him; for they shall see him as he is. They shall need no light of the sun, nor any artificial light; for the Lord God and the Lamb shall be the light of the holy city. In ineffable bliss, inexpressible happiness, and joys that shall never end, they shall bask forever and ever. No want, no anxiety and solicitude; nor fear, nor gloom, nor dreary forebodings; no more heart-aching, heart-burning, nor heart-bleeding; no more doubts, uncertainties, and want of confidence; no more deceptions, delusions, and impositions; no more coldness, lukewarmness, nor backsliding, forever. The saints have reached their home, their everlasting rest, and all is well with them forever. They are beyond the reach of trial, of temptation, and danger, on "the other side of Jordan," in the eternal Canaan, the "rest remaining for the people of God." The broken hearts are all healed, the wounded spirits all bound up, and their griefs all gone. All their tears are wiped away forever. There shall be no more crying nor sorrowing, no more pain nor suffering forever.

To the name of our God and our Lord Jesus the Christ be honor and power everlasting.

SERMON, No. XX.

THEME.—THE PUNISHMENT AFTER DEATH OF THOSE WHO DIE IN THEIR SINS.

TEXT—"The Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust to the day of judgment to be punished."—2 PET. ii: 9.

THE theme selected for this discourse is one of transcendent importance to every accountable human being. All who have any respect for the Bible speak and think of it as containing *the law of God*. The idea of *law* without a *penalty* is nothing short of the most idle fiction. All law contains penalty. Indeed, the very idea of law implies penalty. The law of God, the highest, the grandest, and most sublime law known to mortal man, has not only a penalty, but the most terrible, fearful, and awful penalty ever described by human tongue as its divine sanction. Its salvation, therefore, means something. Its pardon, justification, and deliverance of the soul from sin means something. It is not the empty vaporings of a Universalist about *salvation*, who denies that any man is saved from sin in this life, and maintains that all men, not excepting such a man as Paul the apostle, are sinners as long as they live in this world; who also denies that there will be any sin, lake of fire, hell, second death, or punishment of any kind in the world to come, from which any human being can be

saved. Such a man knows not the meaning of the word *salvation*, and certainly attaches no idea to it, except one the most vague and unintelligible. The penalty of the Bible means something. Our glorious Lord did not ask "How can you escape the condemnation of hell?" nor speak of "eternal condemnation" and "everlasting punishment;" of men being "cast into hell, where the fire shall never be quenched, and where the worm dies not;" or of "the false prophets" being "tormented day and night forever and ever," to scare people, but to *warn them*. "Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we *persuade men*," says Paul. "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." The Lord speaks of a man for whom it would have been better not to have been born.

None have ventured to deny right out that the law of God, as recorded in the Bible, has any penalty. None, till in very modern times, have had the temerity to deny that those who die in their sins will be punished after death. In history there is mention of a class of men, in comparatively ancient times, who were restorationists. These held that there would be a punishment after death, but maintained that it would terminate, and all its subjects would finally be saved. But, among other queer and novel things in our own time, a class of religious adventurers have made their appearance, who entertain the curious, credulous, and gullible with harangues, both extemporaneous and written, exhibiting their adroitness, shrewdness, and sharpness in explaining all the scriptures that speak of the devil or Satan in some way so as to avoid the idea of any literal or personal devil, or real being, or any thing more than the personification of evil or the evil principle; as also so explaining all those scriptures that speak of, or in any way imply a judgment or punishment after death, so as to accord with, or, at least, not refute their theory of ineffable bliss

for all beyond this life. The demoralizing tendency of such teaching and theorizing has been immense, all going to strengthen unbelievers in their unbelief and harden their hearts. As the prophet expresses it: "With lies you have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and *strengthened the hands* of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, *by promising him life.*" Ez. xiii: 22.

Without detaining you, please turn at once to the consideration of the following points:

1. An adequate punishment is not inflicted in this life.
2. There will be a judgment and punishment after death.
3. It is reasonable and just that the punishment after death should be of great duration.
4. The Scriptures clearly teach that the punishment after death will be unlimited in its duration.

Then, without delay or further preliminary, at once please give attention to the first point to be considered:

1. *An adequate punishment is not inflicted in this life.* That men receive not a full and adequate punishment for their sins in this world, is clear from Scripture. This is more than intimated in the text: "The Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust to the day of judgment to be punished." In this scripture the teaching is, that the unjust are "*reserved* to the day of judgment *to be punished*," and not that they are judged or punished as they go along in this life. This one scripture ought to settle the matter with men who tremble at the word of God. But hear the scripture again: "The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved to fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. iii: 7. Here, too, instead of fitting out punishment to men as they pass along through this life, the very heavens and earth,

which are now, are *kept in store, reserved to fire* against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. This, beyond dispute, points *forward* to the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men, and does not refer to it as something now going on.

Paul says, "He who despised the law of Moses died without mercy, on the testimony of two or three witnesses;" and follows this statement with the following question: "Of how much sorer punishment, do you suppose, he shall be considered deserving, who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and has accounted the blood of the covenant, with which he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and has done despite to the Spirit of grace?" Heb. x: 29. Here, beyond all doubt, "a sorer punishment than *death without mercy*," or a severer punishment, is threatened, which can not be inflicted in this life. Death without mercy is the severest punishment possible in this life; and yet the apostle, by implication, brings to view a *severer* punishment than death without mercy, which must be the punishment to which wicked men are *reserved*.

Again, hear an apostle: "Because the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall be the end of them that obey not the Gospel of God?" 1 Pet. iv: 17. The question here is not what shall be the *punishment*, as they pass along through this life, of them who obey not the Gospel of God, but "what shall be the *end?*" The punishment that the apostle looked to is not inflicted as men pass along through this life, but in winding up; it is their *end*, *last* or *final state*. Paul, Heb. vi: 8, does not speak of those whose lot is to be burned as they pass along through this world; but, speaking of the final condition of the wicked, he says, "Whose *end* is to be burned." That "end" is not the *life* of wicked men, or something occurring as they pass along

in life, but something beyond life, the last state—the end. You can not find a heaven for a man beyond his *last state* or *end*.

Many other scriptures could be referred to, showing, beyond all doubt, that a full and complete punishment is not inflicted in this world. But some men can regard what they see and hear, who will not regard the Bible. What may be observed in this world, with people who think and reason for themselves, ought to convince any man that a full and complete retribution is not awarded in this life, either to the good or bad. On the one hand, some of the purest and best of mankind suffer in mind and body in this life, almost without mitigation. Their last days are filled up with troubles of mind, by the transgressions of those allied to them by the ties of the flesh. They languish for long months, and in some instances for years, in beds of affliction. In this life, there appears to them to be but little else than bitterness, sorrow, and suffering. On the other hand, there are those who never know want, sickness, or suffering; whose relations bring no scandal on them, or cause them any grief, but who are not simply *ungodly*, but blasphemers, drunkards, and lecherous persons till the last; who give others trouble indescribable, but never have any trouble themselves, and, at last, go out of this world without an hour's suffering. No one need talk of what such men suffer in *their conscience*. They know not the meaning of the word *conscience*. Now, it is simply a matter of fact, that in these two cases the award is not made in this life. To say that it is, is to say that the reward of the righteous is so insignificant that persons receive it, as they pass along through this life, without knowing that they had received it at all, or knowing what it was; and that the punishment of the wicked, or the hell threatened in the Bible, is so light, so exceedingly mild, that thousands are actually pass-

ing through it, suffering its torments, without knowing it at all! Is it the case that men may have all the rewards promised the righteous in the Bible on the one hand, and suffer all the torments threatened in the Bible on the other hand, and never know it? If the heaven of the righteous is in this world, and the righteous enjoy it in this life; and if the hell of the wicked is in this life, and they suffer its torments in this world, then heaven and its happiness, as well as hell and its torments, are of much less consequence than men have generally supposed.

But this is not true, or the apostle could not have said, "If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable." Then the Lord could not have said, "Whoever denies me before men, him will I also deny *before* my Father and the angels;" nor could any one conceive how we could "lay up treasure in heaven," or "lay up a good foundation against the time to come, in order to lay hold of eternal life." Nothing can be more clear than that the first Christians did not receive their reward in this world, and that they did not think they received it. All the martyrs looked for a reward beyond this life, and refused to deny the Lord, because they feared they would lose the eternal reward. But now your attention will be called to a second proposition:

2. *There will be a judgment and punishment after death.* An account of the case of the rich man and Lazarus is recorded Luke xvi: 19–36. In verse 22 we are informed that "The rich man died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." This is the Lord's own statement. The rich man himself testified, as reported by the Lord, saying, "I am tormented in this flame." Abraham testified, as the Savior reports him, saying, "Thou art tormented." The only use here made of this case is to show clearly that a man was in *torment after death.* This the case does show as clearly as language can express any thing. In

connection with this case, see Luke xii: 4, 5: "Be not afraid of those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has power to cast into hell; yea, I say to you, fear him." Here the Lord is admonishing his disciples to fear God, because he not only can kill, but, after that, cast into hell. This could not be true if there were no hell beyond this life, or beyond death; but "after that"—after the death of the body—the Lord speaks of *casting into hell.* This *Hinnom,* or *Gehenna,* is after death, and the *soul* may be cast into it as well as the *body.* It is useless to speak of the ancient *Valley of Hinnom,* as its fires had been done away more than four hundred years before the Lord uttered this language, and then *souls after death* never were cast into it.

But in the text, with which this discourse commences, the apostle says, "The Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to *reserve* the unjust to the day of judgment *to be punished.*" In the same letter, chapter iii, verse 7, the apostle says: "The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, *reserved* to fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." These passages are both in the same spirit, setting forth the fact that the world is *reserved* to the day of judgment. In connection with this, please hear Paul giving charge to a young preacher: "I charge you, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." 2 Tim. iv: 1. Here is a reference to the *judgment of the dead* at the appearing and kingdom of Christ. This connects the coming of Christ and judgment together; and shows, by the reference to the judgment of the *dead* as well as the *living,* that the judgment will be *after death.* The apostle Peter—Acts x: 42—teaches the same in the follow-

ing words: "And he commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is he who was ordained of God the Judge of the living and the *dead*." Here again is a reference to the judgment of the *dead*. There must be explicit light afforded on this point to show that the dead will be judged, as some are slow to learn. This same apostle Peter, speaking of a certain class of the dead, viz., the antediluvians, tells us the divine purpose in preaching the Gospel to them in the days of Noah, in the following words: "That they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." 1 Pet. iv: 6. In the verse preceding this, speaking of other vile characters, "who shall give account to him who is ready to judge the *living* and the *dead*," the dead are included, showing that the Lord will judge the *dead*.

If the foregoing is not sufficient to satisfy any candid man that the Lord will judge the dead, look at the following: "But I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, in the day of judgment, than for you." Matt. xi: 22. Hear the Lord again: "For I say to you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, in the day of judgment, than for you." Sodom had been buried in ruins ages before the Lord uttered this language, and the cities of Tyre and Sidon had been destroyed from the face of the earth many long centuries before the Lord uttered these words; yet he declared that they should appear in the judgment of which he was speaking, and that it should be more tolerable for their inhabitants than for the Jews, to whom he spoke. No man ever made even a plausible show of argument on the question under review, who denies that these passages clearly show that there will be a judgment *after death*.

But, if you please, attend to our Lord's teaching still further. He says: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in

judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and behold, a greater than Jonas is here. The Queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here." Matt. xii: 41, 42. From the Scriptures now quoted, it is clear that the antediluvians, those of Tyre and Sidon, the Sodomites, the Ninevites, and the Queen of Sheba, all dead and gone ages before the Lord uttered the words quoted, are all to appear in the judgment of which he spoke. But this is not all; there are more than all these to be there. Look at the following: "For God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved to judgment." Here is the clear teaching that the angels are *reserved* to judgment. They will, then, be in the judgment. Please hear of these angels that sinned once more: "And the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness to the judgment of the great day." Jude 6. There has been no judgment in this world, since the writing of the Scriptures, at which the citizens of Tyre and Sidon, of the land of Sodom, of Nineveh, the Queen of Sheba, the antediluvians, the angels who sinned, and those to whom the Savior, in his ministry, spoke, to say nothing of all who have lived since, were present. The reason is, that "it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment." Heb. ix: 27. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and to them who look for him shall he appear the second time without sin (sin offering) to salvation."

The next thing shall be to show that the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the judgment, will all be

connected together. Indeed, the passage just quoted places the judgment after death and the coming of Christ at the same period. Paul quotes Isa. xlv: 23–25, and applies it to the resurrection state, Rom. xiv: 10, 11. Hear him: "But why do you judge your brother? or why do you set at naught your brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Now hear him prove this last statement. "For," says he, "it is written, As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So, then, every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." Thus, you perceive, the very passage quoted thousands of times to prove that all men will be saved, and applied to the resurrection state, from the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, is quoted by Paul—Rom. xiv: 10, 11—and also applied to the resurrection state, to prove that we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and every one of us give an account of himself to God. This settles the question about the judgment after death.

But now turn to 1 Cor. xv: 22, 23, and hear Paul: "As by Adam all die, even so by Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own proper band: Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." The making all alive mentioned here will be in the resurrection of the dead. This passage is very elliptical, and, filling up the ellipsis, will read as follows: "As by Adam all die, even so by Christ shall all be made alive. But every one *made alive* in his own proper band: Christ the first-fruits *made alive;* afterward they that are Christ's *made alive* at his coming." When shall this making alive be? The apostle says "at his coming." This making alive will be in the resurrection and "at his coming." This, beyond doubt, places the resurrection at the coming of Christ. But it does more than this: it discriminates between those who *are Christ's* and those who *are not Christ's* at the coming of Christ and

the resurrection of the dead. The expression "they that are Christ's" implies that there are others who are not Christ's; and this discrimination between those who *are* Christ's and those who are *not* Christ's is at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead. Paul makes the same kind of discrimination in his allusion to the resurrection of the dead, in his reply to Tertullus, Acts xxiv: 14. He says, "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." The Lord himself makes the same discrimination in the words, "You shall be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." An intimation of the same discrimination is found Luke xx: 35, in the following words: "They who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead." See, also, Dan. xii: 2: "And many of them that slept in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The prophet follows in the same connection: "And they who are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they who turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." The same in substance is found in the Lord's own words, John v: 28, 29: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all those who are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they who have done good to the resurrection of life; and they who have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." Thus it is clear that in all these grand allusions to the resurrection of the dead, the grand and awful discriminations are kept up between the righteous and the wicked. This part of the argument will be closed with John's account of the matter, as the whole was represented to him in the island of Patmos. He appeared to have had passed before him, in grand panoramic view, the whole period called "time," the delivering up of the souls in the unseen state, the raising and collecting of the bodies

of the dead from sea and land, and says: "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."

Now turn your eye back, and take one candid look at these wonderful expressions touching the resurrection, and see the continual discriminations between the righteous and the wicked, such as "they who are *Christ's*," "they who shall be accounted *worthy*," "the resurrection of the *just*," "a resurrection both of the *just* and the *unjust*," "they who shall be *wise*," "they who shall turn many to righteousness," "they who have *done good* and they who have *done evil*," "were judged every man according to *his works*," and then tell what these continued and oft-repeated discriminations between the righteous and the wicked mean, made in reference to men in the resurrection of the dead, the coming of the Lord, and the day of judgment. Bear in mind, it is in reference to the state of things after death, where the *living* and *dead*, as they are now, shall be present. The antediluvians, those of Tyre, Sidon, of the land of Sodom, Gomorrah, Nineveh, the Queen of Sheba, and the angels who sinned; those to whom the Lord spoke while in his great mission on earth; all who are in their graves, and all alive on earth, are to appear in that judgment, and be judged according to their works. Those whose names are not found written in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire. Here is the last state of the disobedient, or those who die in their sins.

But while grasping and condensing as much as possible into a narrow space, that all may have a glance at it, please turn your attention to another class of testimony touching the state of those who die in their sins. The passages now to be introduced are negative proofs, some of which have

already been quoted. The Lord says, "He who believes on the Son, has everlasting life: but he who believes not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abides on him." John iii: 36. This passage looks forward as far as unbelievers can be found, and declares, in the most unequivocal terms, that "he who believes not the Son *shall not see life.* In Jude 12, 13, these are described: "They are clouds without water, carried about by winds; trees whose fruit withers, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." This description certainly follows those to their last state. Hear the apostle again: "For many walk, of whom I have told often, and now tell you, even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction." Phil. iii: 18, 19. If the *last state* or the *end* of these persons is *destruction*, it is certainly useless to speak of their ever being saved. The same high and holy authority, comparing persons of corrupt character to "thorns and briers," says they are "rejected and nigh to cursing, whose *end is to be burned.*" Heb. vi: 8. Here is the last state or the end of persons whom the apostle declares it impossible to renew again to repentance; they "are *nigh to cursing, and their end is to be burned.*" Hear the Lord while this momentous question is under investigation. He says, "If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins." John viii: 24. Just before, he had said, "You shall seek me and shall die in your sins: whither I go you can not come." One of these expressions declares that those who believe not shall die in their sins, and the other that those who die in their sins shall not go where the Lord is, or shall not enjoy him. These scriptures never were and never can be harmonized with the theory that all will be saved.

One man, like many idle and speculative persons now, while the Lord was engaged in his public mission, inquired of him, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" Had some religious guides been there, they would have responded, Blessed Master, *they will all be saved.* But our Lord gave that man a much more solemn lesson than that. He replied to the man: "Strive to enter in at the straight gate: for many, I say to you, shall seek to enter in, but shall not be able. When once the Master of the house is risen up, and has shut the door, and you begin to stand without, and knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us; and he shall answer and say to you, I know you not whence you are: then shall you begin to say, We have eat and drank in thy presence, and thou has taught in our streets. But he shall say, I know not whence you are; depart from me, all you workers of iniquity." Luke xiii: 23–27. This language can never apply to men in this world. "Those who seek, shall find;" "those who ask, shall receive;" to "those who knock, it shall be opened;" "whoever will, let him come;" "he who comes to me, I will in nowise cast out," is the language of the Lord to men in this world. As we sing, "The doors of Gospel grace stand open night and day." But the language of the Lord to the idle man, inquiring "Are there few that be saved?" refers to a period of time when the doors of grace shall be shut; when applicants for admission shall not gain an entrance; when they shall seek to enter in, but *shall not be able;* when they shall be thrust away, with the awful words, "Depart, you workers of iniquity: I know you not." Here follows the Lord's reason why he would not receive them: "Because I have called, and you refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but you have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof. I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear comes; when

your fear comes as desolation, and your destruction comes as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish comes on you. Then shall you call on me, but I will not answer; you shall seek me early, but shall not find me." Prov. i: 24–28. This reaches beyond time, beyond the day of grace, beyond this world, beyond all Gospel invitation, beyond all space for repentance. To this list but one more shall now be added. That one contains the closing words of the New Testament: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book." Rev. xxii: 19.

Please now glance your eye over this list, and grasp as far as possible the amount contained in it. What, then, shall be thought of the man who will try to prove that all will be saved, when the Lord declares of some that they "shall not see life"—that "the wrath of God abides on them"—who "die in their sins," of whom the Lord said, "Whither I go you can not come;" those whom he compares to "trees twice dead, and plucked up by the roots;" "to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever;" "whose end is destruction;" who are "rejected, nigh to cursing; whose end is to be burned;" who shall "seek to enter in, but shall not be able," but shall be thrust away, followed by the sentence, "Depart from me, all you workers of iniquity;" whom the Lord shall "mock when their fear comes," and who shall have "their part taken away out of the book of life, and out of the holy city?" Let it be repeated: what shall be thought of the man who shall teach and try to prove that those to whom this language applies shall be saved? Does he believe his Bible?

Having now followed the punishment of those who die in their sins, not only to the state after death, to *hades*, but to the day of judgment; to the coming of the Lord, and

beyond the resurrection of the dead; to the period when those whose names are not written in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire; as the Lord expressed it, "cast into hell, where the worm dies not, and the fire shall never be quenched;" into the **gehenna** of fire. The next point to consider is the **duration** of this punishment. This opens the way for the third proposition, submitted at the commencement of this discourse.

3. **It is reasonable that the punishment of those who die in their sins should be of great duration.** One fallacy common in reasoning on this subject must now be exposed. Men are apt to speak of the shortness of the time the wicked are engaged in sinning, and, with an air of triumph, exclaim, Can it be possible that the sins committed in a finite state can have an infinite punishment? or can it be possible that the sins committed in this limited space of **time** should incur a punishment of unlimited duration? Those who put the matter in this way maintain that it is unreasonable that sins committed in such a short space of time shall incur a punishment of vast duration. But it is one thing to hear to sophistry, and another and very different thing to hear to sound reason and common sense. The question then comes up in this form first: Does the time employed in transgression, in any court, human or divine, have anything to do in determining the duration of the punishment? Who is prepared to affirm on this proposition? Who argues in court that the murderer must have only a very limited punishment because he committed the crime in a **very short space of time?** Certainly no man whose legal advice is worth anything. What jurist, in making out and giving a legal opinion, ever mentions the **short space of time** employed in the commission of crime as a reason for **limited punishment?** No one whose opinion is of any weight. The duration of time employed in violating the law has nothing to do in de-

termining either the *duration* or the *severity* of the punishment. It is nothing but a sophistry to gull the simple that refers to the duration of the time occupied in the commission of crime, as having any thing to do in determining the duration or the severity of penalties.

What, then, is it that has to do in determining the term and severity of punishment? *The greatness of the crime.* What do men reason from in considering and determining the magnitude of transgression? From considerations such as the following:

1. The greatness, goodness, and majesty of the authority violated by the transgressor.
2. The design of the transgressor.
3. The deliberation with which the offense is committed.
4. The results of the transgression.

It is no difference whether the transgressor was a minute, an hour, a day, or a year engaged in committing the offense, so far as determining the penalty is concerned. Questions come up touching the greatness, goodness, and majesty of the law violated; the malignity of the design of the transgressor; the coolness, deliberateness, and premeditation with which the offense was committed; the nature, importance, and duration of the results of the transgression. When a man is being tried for murder, the attorneys do not dwell on the duration of time occupied in committing the murder; they speak of the great authority and majesty of the law violated, its importance in maintaining order, protecting property and life; of the malignant design of the murderer; the coolness, deliberation, and premeditation of the murderer; the terrible results of the crime, in striking down the noble son of a father and mother, the affectionate husband, and support of a wife; a kind and good father of children; the reckless and awful deed of sending a man into eternity without a moment's reflection or preparation,

and thus cutting him off from all that is dear to him on earth. These are the themes dwelt on in making up a decision in regard to the penalty.

In the government of God, what proportion does the duration of time occupied in sin bear to the results of the sin committed? How long was Paine employed in writing his infidel book, falsely styled "The Age of Reason?" At most, only a short space of time. But where will be the end of the results of that book? None but omniscience can see. Shall men of sense maintain that the duration of the punishment for the sin of writing such a book must be short because he did it in a short space of time? Certainly not. The Lord, the righteous Judge, will look at the results of the sin; the terrible nature of those results, and the duration of them. The results of the sin of writing that book will last while time shall last, and extend into eternity. The results of the sin will never disappear. So the results of the works of a good man will last while time shall last, and be seen in eternity. This is one reason why the world is not ready for final judgment. The works of men have not wrought out their results yet. In the final judgment, all the works of men will have run their course, and their results will all be open before an assembled universe, while the Lord shall *render to every man according to his works.*

If a man, then, in a short life-time can set on foot schemes of sin that shall continue their results, working ruin among men while time shall last, and the consequences extend into eternity, is any thing clearer than that the punishment for such sins should be of great duration? The effects of a man's transgressions do not cease at death; but, in numerous instances, not only continue after his death, but widen and abound vastly more after his death than while he was living. The consequences of sin are by no means of short

duration. They will last till time shall end, nor will they then terminate. They will last co-existent with the years of God. If the injury a man can do in a short space of time has eternal results, is it any wonder that he should suffer eternal punishment?

But the closing proposition of this discourse is the following:

4. *The Scriptures clearly teach that the punishment after death will be unlimited in its duration.*

Many have been the idle things said by men who know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God touching the duration of the final punishment. Among these, it has been frequently said we never read of "an endless hell in the Bible." To this it may be replied, that we do not. Hell is a *place*—not *time*, either limited or unlimited. Of course, neither the Bible nor any book from an intelligent source speaks of an *endless place*. The Bible does not speak of the *length* nor the *breadth* of the place of punishment, but the Bible does speak of the *duration of the punishment* of those *in that place*. This is the matter in hand now.

The Lord gives some pretty plain intimations on this point—Mark iii: 29—in the words: "He who shall sin against the Holy Spirit has *never* forgiveness, but is in danger of *eternal* condemnation." There could be no danger of "eternal condemnation," if there was no such thing in existence as *eternal condemnation*; nor would the Lord have spoken of a person who shall *never* be forgiven, unless a person might *never* be forgiven. A person *never forgiven*, of course, remains under *eternal condemnation*. Here, the terms used to express the duration of the condemnation are as strong as language can afford in both the original and the English. The man who shall *never* be forgiven, and remains under *eternal* condemnation, is unquestionably lost. The duration of his condemnation is unlimited. How can

you express the unlimited duration of a man's unpardoned state, if the words "has never forgiveness" do not do it?

The same wonderful language is used to express the fire of hell. The Lord says "it shall never be quenched." What is the meaning of this, and what shall we think of him who shall try to prove that the punishment in this fire, that "shall never be quenched," shall terminate? This punishment can never terminate till that which our Lord says "*shall never be*" shall come to pass, or till some man shall prove these words of the Lord not true.

Those who have argued most stoutly against all punishment after death, have thousands of times quoted and applied the words "The Lord God shall wipe off all tears," to the eternal state. In this they are correct. John so applies this language of the prophet—Rev. xxi: 4. But he soon finishes his description of those in the holy city, New Jerusalem, and, just four verses further on, gives an account of others not in the holy city, in the following words: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." Notice, this is in the resurrection state, at the precise same period when all tears shall be wiped away forever from those in the holy city. Some have desired to know something of the *object* of this "lake of fire." It would be well, probably, to furnish them a little light on that important subject. Matt. xxv: 41, the Lord says that it was "prepared for the devil and his angels." This is the "everlasting fire," or fire that "shall never be quenched," where "the worm dies not," is "prepared for the devil and his angels," and is the "lake of fire" into which the wicked shall be cast after the resurrection and the last judgment.

The angels who sinned, we are informed—Jude 6—the

Lord has reserved in everlasting chains of darkness to the judgment of the great day. "Chains," here, figuratively represent the *power* by which the angels who sinned are bound. "Everlasting chains" is the *everlasting power* by which they are bound. "Everlasting," here, does not come from the Greek *aionion*, as it does usually, but from *aidios*, which occurs in but two places in the New Testament, viz., Rom. i: 20 and Jude 6. In the former place it expresses the unlimited duration of the existence of the godhead, and the latter the duration of the power by which the angels that sinned are bound. Matt. xxv: 41, the Lord calls the fire, into which the wicked shall be cast, "everlasting fire." Matt. xxv: 46, he says of the wicked, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." The same Greek word that the Lord uses to express the duration of the fire and the punishment, he uses, in the same connection, to express the duration of the life of the righteous or the state of glory. At the same time that the righteous enter "life eternal," or the state of glory, the wicked "go away into everlasting punishment"—"into everlasting fire;" and the same Greek word *aionion*, that expresses the duration of the fire and punishment, in the same connection expresses the duration of the life of the saints or the state of glory; and it is as likely that the happiness of the righteous shall cease as that this fire, which the Lord calls "everlasting fire," and which, he says, shall "never be quenched," and this punishment which he calls "everlasting," shall terminate. As certain as "life eternal" is endless, or unlimited in its duration, so certain the punishment of those who die in their sins will be endless or unlimited in its duration.

The expression, "forever and ever," occurs some twenty-three times in the New Testament, and is not used in a limited sense in a single instance. It expresses endless or unlimited duration in every instance. It is used to express

the duration of the existence of God, of Christ, of the praises of God, and the punishment of the wicked. It occurs in such expressions as the following: "Him that lives forever and ever;" "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, to him who sits on the throne, and to the Lamb, forever and ever." That this expression means unlimited duration in those passages—in the one case the unlimited duration of the Deity, and, in the other, the unlimited duration of the ascriptions of praises to him, no one denies. This expression is found thirteen times in the book of Revelation. In ten of those occurrences it expresses the duration of the life of God, the life of Christ, and the duration of the ascending praises to heaven. In all those places, that it means unlimited duration, all admit. The same expression precisely is applied to the punishment of the wicked, three times, in the same book. Twice it is said, "The smoke of their torment ascended forever and ever;" and once it is said that "The devil who deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."

Do you say the conclusion is terrible? It is terrible. So is it terrible that intelligent men and women will not listen to the voice of God—will not obey their Creator! Nothing but ruin can befall them. Repent, then, turn to the Lord, and live forever.